DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 493 EA 002 886

AUTHOR	Hamilton, Norman K., Ed.; Saylor, J. Galen, Ed.
TITLE	Humanizing the Secondary School.
INSTITUTION	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	134p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.75, Quantity discounts)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Creativity, Curriculum Design, *Human Dignity, *Humanism, Individualized Programs, Individual Power, Leadership Training, Professional Recognition, *Relevance (Education), *Secondary Schools, *Secondary School Students, Teacher Militancy, Values

ABSTRACT

These papers, presented during ASCD-sponsored conference, confront educators with issues in and alternatives for making secondary schools a more humanizing experience for students. The contributors and their articles are: Norman K. Hamilton, "Alternatives in Secondary Education"; Thornton B. Monez and Norman L. Bussiere, "The High School in Human Terms"; Herbert A. Thelen, "The Humane Person Defined"; James B. MacDonald, "The High School in Human Terms: Curriculum Design"; Robert S. Soar, "Achieving Humaneness: Supporting Research"; Dwight W. Allen, "A Technology and Performance Curriculum"; Lloyd S. Michael, "Alternative Modes of Organizing Secondary Schools"; John L. Wallen, "Building Leadership Skills"; and a summary chapter by J. Galen Saylor, "Some Characteristics of a Humane Secondary School." (MLF)

PRINTED BY THE STANDARD REGISTER COMPANY, U. S. A.
FORM 0801

ED0 40493

Humanizing the Secondary School

Prepared by the ASCD Council
on Secondary Education

Edited by NORMAN K. HAMILTON
and J. GALEN SAYLOR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 002 886

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE
AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES.
MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION
ONLY.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.   Washington, D.C. 20036

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

Copyright © 1969 by the
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Price: $2.75

The materials printed herein are the expressions of the writers. They do not represent endorsement by, nor a statement of policy of, the Association.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 70-75856

Preface

Humanizing the Secondary School reflects our current and deep concern with forces at work which seem to dehumanize students and teachers. This volume suggests some of the solutions to the problems inherent in making secondary education a more truly humanizing experience.

This new publication by the Secondary Education Council of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development deserves thoughtful and deliberate study. The Council and the co-editors, Norman K. Hamilton and J. Galen Saylor, in editing and organizing several significant papers presented during conferences sponsored by the Council, have spotlighted *humaneness* as the most critical need in American secondary education.

The booklet makes very potent the vast gap between thinkers and scholars, on the one hand, and the practitioners in the field, on the other hand. The presentation also shows how sorely needed is the closing of the gap if secondary schools are to survive the student revolution for relevancy, the teachers' insurrection for professional status and welfare rights, and the social revolution which would take the direction of the schools away from professional educators. Never has secondary education been so threatened from within or from the outside.

Let us hope that the first to ponder and act upon the establishment of the humanizing forces which are suggested in this booklet will be professional secondary educators. If they do so, this booklet will be interpreted forcefully to the community by the actions of those who have primary responsibility for such change.

January 1969

Muriel Crosby
President 1968-69
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA

Acknowledgments

The Association wishes to thank the Secondary Education Council and the co-editors, Norman K. Hamilton and J. Galen Saylor for the preparation of the manuscript for this booklet. Robert R. Leeper, Associate Secretary and Editor, ASCD Publications, edited the manuscript of this booklet and was responsible for its production. Technical production was handled by Claire J. Larson, Lana G. Pipes, Nancy C. Bailey, Teola T. Jones, and Karen T. Brakke.

Contents

Preface v
Muriel Crosby

Acknowledgments vii

Contributors xi

Alternatives in Secondary Education 1
Norman K. Hamilton

The High School in Human Terms 7
Thornton B. Monez and Norman L. Bussiere

The Humane Person Defined 17
Herbert A. Thelen

The High School in Human Terms: Curriculum Design 35
James B. Macdonald

Achieving Humaneness: Supporting Research 55
Robert S. Soar

A Technology and Performance Curriculum 79
Dwight W. Allen

Alternative Modes of Organizing Secondary Schools 89
Lloyd S. Michael

Building Leadership Skills 101
John L. Wallen

Some Characteristics of a Humane Secondary School 121
J. Galen Saylor

Contributors

Muriel Crosby, President,
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, Washington, D.C.; formerly Acting Superintendent for Educational Programs, Public Schools, Wilmington, Delaware

Norman K. Hamilton, Assistant Superintendent of Schools,
Portland Public Schools, Portland, Oregon

Thornton B. Monez, Professor of Education,
Richmond College of the City University of New York, Staten Island, New York

Norman L. Bussiere, Principal,
James Caldwell High School, Consolidated School District of Caldwell-West Caldwell, Caldwell, New Jersey

Herbert A. Thelen, Professor of Education,
Graduate School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

James B. Macdonald, Professor of Education,
Department of Social Foundations, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee

Robert S. Soar, Professor of Education,
Institute for Development of Human Resources,
College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville

Dwight W. Allen, Dean, School of Education,
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Lloyd S. Michael, Professor of Education,
School of Education, Northwestern University,
Evanston, Illinois

John L. Wallen, Acting Regional Coordinator,
NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science (NW),
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory,
Portland, Oregon

J. Galen Saylor, Professor of Secondary Education,
Department of Secondary Education, Teachers College,
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Alternatives in Secondary Education

Norman K. Hamilton

THE traditions which have bound secondary schools to set patterns are being broken. American secondary education is on the verge of a revolution which holds much hope and some apprehension. Various examples of this are evident. The six-three-three pattern of school organization is being challenged by the introduction of the "middle school." The Carnegie Unit is becoming of more interest in historical retrospect than as a device for controlling scheduling. Schools are becoming more comprehensive as they provide for the once-forgotten dropout, and yet more homogeneous in student population as they specialize in serving the increasingly stratified, urbanized, neighborhood population clusters of the inner city and the suburbs.

New technology is making complex scheduling schemes practicable and at the same time imposing new kinds of inflexibilities on the schools. There are massive industrial and agency efforts to produce instructional systems packaged tightly for teacher use. The self-styled "innovative" groups sometimes seem to be promoting change for the sake of change. And all of this at a time when the public is expecting more than ever of its schools; at a time also when students themselves are becoming restive and challenging the authority of schools to impose restraints on behavior, personal appearance, or free access to books and the debate of controversial ideas.

Never have secondary schools had a better opportunity for self-examination and decisive action. Never before have they had such massive forces exerting pressure on them nor have they had so many alternatives to choose from as they chart their future courses. The schools can decide now whether they are to be more humane, more sensitive to student needs, and more able to serve the individual; or, they can become even more rigid and inflexible so that only the conforming students will pass through while others will escape to be discovered by the Job Corps, "free" universities, or other institutions yet to be established.

There is scarcely any way to avoid making changes for a future which demands redirection. Yet change must come from, and be judged by, the inclusion of attention to the population (student) needs; and proper evaluation and pilot trial of innovative procedures must be designed to achieve desirable objectives. Schools which engage in such change processes must explore many options and must of necessity become more alive and vital because teachers and administrators will have to work more closely than ever before with one another and with students.

Concerted Efforts

These are activities which schools have wanted. They have wanted concerted staff efforts to look at students as individuals, to set worthy instructional goals, to examine alternative approaches to curriculum and instruction. They have wanted to evaluate new approaches to content and methods, to see what new hypotheses emerge, and to try out innovations which their studies suggest. Such effort introduces a cycle of self-renewing activity which, if insightfully followed, can make schools exciting places in which to be, both for teachers and students. In such a school the creative, innovative teacher (too often the lonely, avoided one on the staff) can find support and satisfaction from colleagues and students.

Schools which truly innovate with purpose do not necessarily emerge as adopting the usual patterns identified with innovation. They may or may not find that team arrangements serve their purposes. They may or may not accept organized systems of instructional materials. The truly innovative schools create those teaching arrangements which serve them best.

Too often, however, schools have followed one of several innovative patterns. They have "adopted" team teaching, new scheduling devices, or new technological inventions which often amount simply to superimposing new administrative arrangements on top of old ideas of rigid course content and teaching procedures. These are not humanizing influences. These are the sorts of changes which cause a student to lose identity as a person, to be less dedicated to learning. Such changes may require further conformity to increasingly complex and limiting patterns. Thus, change can defeat the purposes intended and can deny even the insightful teacher the freedom he formerly had in his individual classroom to reach his students.

In the process of change, schools must examine what new technology has to offer. Is technology to serve the purposes of education or is it to become the master of education? Instructional materials systems and computerized materials can be a freeing influence on schools. They can permit students to pursue individual developmental study programs. They can provide teachers with more alternatives in both methods and materials. Learning laboratories and instructional materials resource centers can provide an abundance of material resources and devices to promote learning, and computerized programming can show alternatives in the use of time, rooms, and staff. Good schools will seek ways of using new technology better and will influence the development of teaching products according to sound, humanizing goals.

New and promising concerns are emerging in the stated goals of secondary education. Some have to do with a student's becoming "intellectually autonomous and willing to trust his judgment"; and some stress "responsibility for one's own actions," plus the skills "to use knowledge, draw inferences from it, while seeking better solutions to social and personal problems." These are the truly humanizing goals of education. These are the things that make an educated, self-sufficient person able to deal confidently and insightfully with the ever-increasing complexities the future holds for all of us.

The Individual As a Person

The so-called "new" curriculum content is meant very often to liberate the mind further and free the individual from traditional subject matter "bodies of knowledge," and to provide him with the skills to explore ideas, to seek information, to generalize from it, and to project these generalizations toward new and better ways of living. The movement toward the humanities blocks is an effort to break down subject matter lines. These are not revolts from subject matter content, but movements toward more acceptance of the interrelatedness of content and skills by creative, confident, and responsible individuals who are able and willing to see issues, discuss them, and work with integrity toward more creative solutions to common problems.

The secondary schools must look at each alternative. They can attempt to protect the status quo and reject new ideas out of fear that new approaches will create insoluble problems. Or, they can be open to and evaluative of ideas and exploratory approaches that so many advocate for students.

Certainly schools will not be the same 20 years from now as they are today. Toward what direction, then, shall they go? Toward freeing the individual to explore and to think for himself? Toward accepting those devices which humanize the schools and rejecting those that do not? Toward individualized programs according to the needs of the individual or toward further influencing him to dependence and insecurity?

These are all choices that educators can and must make. The Secondary Education Council of ASCD has raised these concerns at two conferences. The issues presented at these conferences are contained in this booklet for earnest consideration by the reader. The booklet opens with a discussion of alternatives in values toward which secondary schools can move in the Monez and Bussiere chapter, "The High School in Human Terms."

Herbert Thelen's chapter follows with a discussion of the range of values of the humane person and how he sustains and extends his humaneness.

Macdonald discusses curriculum design, not so much from the standpoint of curriculum content as from the conditions under which curriculum should be selected and the humanizing goals it should achieve.

A summary of the steadily accumulating research evidence which supports the argument for an open learning environment is presented by Robert Soar.

Dwight Allen points out alternative strategies for the development and use of educational applications of technology.

Lloyd Michael in his chapter analyzes the essential elements of a secondary school by examining various methods of managing time, space, and human and material resources as a means of achieving the humanizing goals of secondary education.

John Wallen helps us look frankly at ourselves as secondary leaders in terms of role expectation and personal qualities which fit us to be effective.

J. Galen Saylor in a summary chapter draws inferences from the various points of view and suggests the characteristics of a truly humane secondary school.

The purpose of this publication is to bring before educators issues for analysis and to point out alternatives for those who help select the goals toward which secondary schools should be directed.

Each chapter presents the individual views of the author for thoughtful consideration. As for the ASCD Secondary Education Council, we hope that schools will favor those approaches which value the individual as a person.

The High School in Human Terms

Thornton B. Monez
Norman L. Bussiere

Monez and Bussiere raise the question, "Is it possible for a high school to justify looking at its own program and evaluating its effectiveness through the medium of the young person himself?" The assumption is that it can, by rethinking the shape and the design of the opportunities for learning experiences in our high schools in relation to the meanings which make up the individual world of each young person. Questions are raised in the chapter concerning the individual young person in the school. The questions center around:

Autonomy and Sensitivity to Experience
Open-Endedness and Responsibility
Objectivity and Involvement
Complexity and Perfection
Spontaneity and Creativeness
Integrity and Humanness.

Essentially this chapter sets the tone for the publication. It *discusses each of the above concerns with supporting arguments drawn from the literature and with contrasting alternatives.* —N.K.H.

CHARACTERISTICS of the present-day high school have been described in various ways. Aside from assorted statements of purposes and goals, one characteristic or disposition of the high school toward itself is represented in its day-to-day functioning. Frequently, the high school is regarded as a place where young people circulate through a number of selected classroom activities in which the first and foremost feature seems to be evaluation of learning outcomes.

Certainly, learning outcomes in many present-day high schools are seen as information-getting, remembering, recognizing, and solving problems which have predetermined solutions. The process of learning in such classrooms is often viewed as reinforcing the "right" response, evaluating, marking, ranking, or otherwise conditioning a young person for his correctness or exactness in recalling or processing information. Thus, learning tends to focus on something other than a process through which a young person can come to terms with the realities of his own life.

The Tests of a Humane High School

Is it possible for a high school to justify looking at its own program and evaluating its effectiveness through the medium of the young person himself? We believe this is possible if some assumptions can be accepted:

1. Human beings together can influence the quality of living in the society or community of which they are a part.
2. Through education, a community can bring into a more desirable condition its purposes and its functioning if its young people can experience humanizing, uplifting, and regenerating contacts with reality.
3. The real test of any proposal for education, be it an organizational scheme, curriculum design, or classroom practice, is found in the quality of the people affected by it. A program or proposal cannot be judged good, mediocre, or poor aside from this test.

If we believe that these assumptions have validity, any attempt to design a rationale for secondary schools must ultimately take into account the answers to at least four questions:

1. What kinds of individuals make a healthy, dynamic, and democratic community?

2. How can we identify those qualities and competencies in an individual which will help him become the kind of person who, together with others, can produce this community?

3. Is it possible for the present-day high school to have a genuinely effective role in developing individuals who can make this kind of community?

4. What would a secondary school be like if the development of such qualities were a primary goal?

Ultimately, a high school is only what an individual young person perceives it to be. The degree of relevance in any program of education is a function of the perception of the individual who is affected by it. The high school which recognizes that it exists primarily to help each young person in his search for significance and meaning will also recognize that a young person's perception is formed as he moves within the school and tests its responsiveness against his own sense of reality.

The high school would also recognize that each young person is different from all young people in some ways, but he is like them in others. His uniqueness is determined by such factors as intelligence, abilities, physical attributes, and personality. His sameness is determined by what he has in common with others: his desires, his affections and self-respect, his knowledge that he is alive and that other people are like him.

He brings to school each day a very real and personal world which he has put together for himself. He takes from his school experience, as he does from all his experience, those aspects which have some bearing on his world. Although oriented to the present he sees his future not only in terms of what is crucial to him now but also in terms of the control he can come to exercise over his future. Knowledge is neutral, and although the school can sometimes force him to use it in superficial ways, only as he makes it personal does it become relevant to his world.

A young person's test of relevance is centered in his individual searching, his probing, and his need to make sense of his environment. If in his testing he finds a pervasive system of priorities based on information processing, grading, and certifying, then he has little alternative but to learn to use knowledge superficially in his search for deeper meanings. The superficial use of knowledge becomes part of his problem then, and it little matters what the stated objectives, curriculum design, or school organization may mean to educators or parents if the young person perceives these to be unrelated to his emerging sense of reality.

There is a need to rethink the shape and design of learning experiences in our high schools in terms of the meanings which inhabit the personal world of each young person. In the process of rethinking, it may be helpful to raise some questions concerning the young person himself and what he might come to value as he moves through the high school experience.

The following may be viewed as some examples of questions which reflect the kinds of qualities that Maslow[1] has found are valued by those individuals who are to a high degree healthy, "self-actualizing," contributing members of society. Gordon[2] also posits some of these same questions as she ponders the effect they might have on the elementary classroom if the values they reflect were to become dominant.

Autonomy and Sensitivity to Experience

Is the young person genuinely sensitive to his experience? Does he want to know who he is and where he fits in? Is he curious and searching for knowledge, eager to nourish himself on information in a variety of contexts and meanings? Is he willing to try things he has not done before? Will he venture into an unknown experience, make mistakes, and learn from them? Is he impelled from within to seek the truth, to correct his perceptions, and to arrive at his own conclusions? Is he intellectually autonomous and willing to trust his own judgment?

However important these representative fragments from various content areas may be, they illustrate the dilemma of the curriculum worker or the administrator. Significantly, the end—or the beginning—cannot be found in this domain; it resides in each learner. The task of the school is to help each individual develop a concept of and a role for self, and to facilitate a continuing enculturation; it is to enable each learner to make individual sense out of the universe of stimuli.[3]

---

[1] Abraham H. Maslow. "Psychological Data and Value Theory." In: Abraham H. Maslow, editor. *New Knowledge in Human Values.* New York: Harper & Brothers (Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.), 1959.

[2] Julia Gordon Weber. "Values in the Classroom." *The National Elementary Principal* 42 (2): 30-34; November 1962.

or

Is the individual dependent upon someone else to lead him to ready-made conclusions, to mechanically dispensed information and knowledge? Is he afraid to cope with the unknown, afraid to risk a response that might be in error, reluctant to conjecture and loath to find his own truth? Is his interest based on getting good grades and scoring well on tests? Is his energy directed toward the grading system? Is he unable to weigh and judge his own inner criteria?

I have worked in the past several years with too many of our most brilliant students—often natural scientists or mathematicians—who have fled further work in the sciences (I hope only temporarily) by academic failure, boredom, or vocational career switches that were quite alien to their scientific talents and temperaments. They say they want to learn more about "life," about their own feelings and values and personal relations, which have been eclipsed ever since ninth grade when some enterprising teacher singled them out to win a Westinghouse talent competition or to be a National Merit Scholar.[4]

Open-Endedness and Responsibility

Does the individual have a true tolerance for "open-endedness"? Can he support a variety of conflicting answers and tolerate disorganization as he works his way to a course of personal action for which he can be responsible? Is he able to adapt effectively as new knowledge and insight reveal that a situation calls for different behavior? Is he able to hold all conclusions open to change, recognizing that there may be more than one right solution to a problem, whether in mathematics or life?

Too many of our brilliant students coming out of college today tend to be merely commentators, observers, and critics of society. We seem to have an oversupply of detached observers, young people who are skilled cocktail party conversationalists and brilliant analysts of other peoples' activity and behavior. We have a great undersupply of young people who can and will take responsibility—"doers," innovators, and risk-takers. So many young men and women from first-rate colleges reveal an unwillingness to be committed fully. They seem reluctant to participate actively in the world in which we are living.[5]

---

[3] Leslee J. Bishop. "Senior High School: To What Ends?" *Educational Leadership* 23 (4): 268; January 1966.

[4] Douglas H. Heath. "Do 'Modern' School Curriculums Help Students Mature?" *College Board Review*, No. 58, p. 23; Winter 1965-66.

or

Does he tend to refuse to recognize that there are likely to be many solutions to a problem? Does he tend to be driven by fear or other anxiety, wanting to hold fast to one solution as correct? Does he tend to shrink from taking responsibility for the consequences of his thought and action? Does he tend to cling to one kind of response as situations change?

The student who ranks first in his class may be genuinely brilliant or he may be a compulsive worker or the instrument of domineering parents' ambitions or a conformist or a self-centered careerist who has shrewdly calculated his teachers' prejudices and expectations and discovered how to regurgitate efficiently what they want. Or he may have focused narrowly on grade-getting as compensation for his inadequacies in other areas, because he lacks other interests or talents or lacks passion and warmth or normal healthy instincts or is afraid of life. The top high school student is often, frankly, a pretty dull and bloodless or peculiar fellow. The adolescent with wide-ranging curiosity and stubborn independence, with a vivid imagination and desire to explore fascinating bypaths, to follow his own interest, to contemplate, to read the unrequired books, the boy filled with sheer love of life and exuberance, may well seem to his teachers troublesome, undisciplined, a rebel, may not conform to their stereotype, and may not get the top grades and the highest rank in the class. He may not even score at the highest level in the standard multiple choice admissions tests, which may well reward the glib, facile mind at the expense of the questioning, independent, or slower but more powerful, more subtle and more interesting and original mind.[6]

Objectivity and Involvement

Does he have a clear perception of reality? Can he be objective, seeing all aspects of a situation or condition apart from himself, in a detached way if necessary? Conversely, does he have the power to be an active participant in the life situations in which he finds himself? Is he able to become involved in those issues which affect him? Does he take initiative in involving himself and others toward bettering the human situation?

---

[5] Vernon R. Alden. "What Kind of Excellence?" *Saturday Review* 47 (29): 52; July 18, 1964. Copyright © 1964, Saturday Review, Inc.

[6] William Bender, former Dean of Admissions, Harvard University. From a verbatim quote in an article by Vernon R. Alden, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

In adolescence, however, a major change in morality becomes possible. Adolescence brings new powers of cognition and new feelings—a capacity for self-consistency, an ability to locate oneself in time, and a need for historical relatedness, a talent for self-regulation and a will to stand unaided.

In the process, there may develop the beginning of an ethical sense beyond morals, a sense of the desirable and the undesirable that embraces and is supported by remnants of the childish conscience, but that transcends it in abstractions, historical realism, and consistency with other commitments and conceptions of self.

All of this may happen, but often it does not.[7]

or

Does he tend to interpret the various facets of a given situation mostly in terms of himself? Is he mostly concerned about the effect an idea or proposed action will have on his own condition? Does he tend to take a passive, neutral, or indifferent position rationalizing his unwillingness to become involved when situations call for direct engagement?

Classroom assignment of children on artificial and even spurious differences is not a constructive approach to providing a social setting for students to learn the skills of negotiation of differences in the settlement of conflict. Students who learn to hate and despise themselves for their inadequacies, and lack of sense of worth, find likely targets outside themselves: those who reap the rewards of the school, the constituted authority which seems only to care about social control over and above their learning, and finally the society which fails to treat them as humans and forces them to face their humiliation every day.[8]

Complexity and Perfection

As a young person comes to understand how things relate to one another in increasing complexity, is he able to live comfortably with that complexity without the need to oversimplify or distort? Can he generalize bodies of facts into meaningful wholes? Can he use a variety of thinking processes? Does he enjoy and is he awed by the perfection of form achieved by unifying diverse elements? Does he seek this in all that he undertakes, whether in art, science, language, or in classroom living? Is he able to judge this by his own inner criteria?

---

[7] Kenneth Keniston. "Morals and Ethics." *The American Scholar* 34 (4): 629; Autumn 1965. Copyright © 1965 by the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. Reprinted by permission.

[8] Maurice J. Eash. "Rethink Ability Grouping." *New Jersey Education Association Review* 39:178; 1965.

To conclude: In gauging the effect of various educational changes on the transition of the student from school to college, I hope we educators will not fall into the autocentric trap of believing that what we consider important influences on student maturing—namely, the influences of ourselves and our academic arrangements—are the only important factors. At Haverford, we do not find that specific kinds of academic preparation, advanced placement, or other special opportunities in biology or mathematics or physics or German are in themselves the crucial determinants of how smoothly the transition will be made. They are not even crucial in determining whether the student will be able to recover from the disorganization that a good college produces in a student in his early years.

What I hope is that the student comes psychologically ready to be disorganized, to be educable, and that the curricular changes at the secondary level will have helped increase his maturity and inner strength to put that disorganization to educable uses. To consider only the academic aspects of curricular change as factors that promote educability is to limit our understanding of what makes an educable person more mature and a mature person more educable.[9]

or

Does he tend to respond with ready-made verbal descriptions without proving the intricacies of phenomena? Is he insensitive to design, form, and the unifying forces in art, science, and society? Is he impatient and careless with detail, working to play the classroom game for grades and external rewards more than for the inner meanings?

There are too many incompetent and timid educators creating the ideological climate within which the schools operate. By refusing to deal realistically and imaginatively with the basic needs of youth, by avoiding controversy on fundamental issues of the day, by failing to encourage deep criticism and dissent, they are bankrupting themselves and forfeiting leadership.

What is taught in the school promotes narrow conformity, "social robotism" instead of social and altruistic thought. The upshot is that all but the very best secondary schools are beginning to resemble "co-educational prison-harems under the management of intellectual eunuchs." [10]

---

[9] Douglas H. Heath, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

Spontaneity and Creativeness

Is the young person spontaneous and imaginative as he draws upon the flow of energy from his thinking processes as they occur with or without definite purpose? Can he combine these and create his own meaningful structures? Can he take leaps as he strives for understandings and as he accumulates real experience, such that his efforts to draw the various parts of his life into a meaningful whole thus help him to gain new insights? Can he view his world and its potential with a spirit of objectivity as well as with a sense of wonder and positive hope?

> But for all your stimulation and guidance the creative impulse towards growth comes from within, and is intensely characteristic of the individual. Education is the guidance of the individual towards a comprehension of the art of life; and by the art of life I mean the most complete achievement of varied activity expressing the potentialities of that living creature in the face of its actual environment.[11]

or

Is he bound by custom in his thinking, unable to recognize or follow an intuition or test its product against the realities of experience? Is he unimaginative and does he lack buoyancy and color? Does he incline to be distrustful, tending to believe that human conduct is motivated generally by self-interest? Does he take a cynical view toward the world?

> The creative process requires receiving raw, undigested data and focusing or forming this into an expressive symbol, which may be manifest in any one of a variety of forms and may happen through the medium of any discipline of art or knowledge. It is important, however, that the learning situation provide open-ended problems; that is, assignments in which there are manufactured possible solutions or ways to the solutions, rather than problems which have one previously determined answer or response.[12]

[10] Ivor Kraft. "The Coming Crisis in Secondary Education." *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals* 49 (298): 5-42; February 1965.

[11] Alfred N. Whitehead. *The Aims of Education.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. 248 pp.

[12] New Jersey Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey. *Secondary School Bulletin* 19 (4); February 1963.

Integrity and Humanness

Does the young person have a sense of wholeness, of completeness, of being a person in his own right? Does he have self-respect and an appreciation of his potential? Is he able to trust his own experience and stand alone if need be to uphold what seems to him to be true? Is he able to accept others as they are, seeing that unique differences add to each person's worth? Does he have strong inner moral values and purposes and a sense of responsibility toward himself and others?

We can make possible "fulfillment" education for all pupils. While a curriculum revolution may be under way in mathematics and science, one of the most significant human needs has been neglected or overlooked. The need is related to self and the human condition. Only when this need occupies a central position in the curriculum will fulfillment education become a reality. To achieve this kind of education pupils must come to explore and learn independently. Equally important they must be introduced to ethics and values.[13]

or

Does he lack faith in himself? Does he have a poor image of himself as a functioning person? Does he dimly view his own potential? Does he find it awkward to interact with others because, lacking self-respect, he finds it difficult to respect others? Is his sense of responsibility toward himself and others weak? Do his moral values and purposes, dominated by forces outside himself, tend to be weak and unreliable?

About the time I was leaving Harvard, a year and a half ago, concern was being expressed about the admission practices being followed by many highly selective institutions. Professor David McClelland warned that these colleges and universities are paying too much attention to one kind of excellence: "academic excellence—skill in taking examinations, in following instructions, and finding solutions to problems set by others."

"Too little attention," he said, "is being paid to other important qualities—qualities such as entrepreneurial spirit, curiosity, sensitivity to other human beings, compassion, richness, and variety of imaginative life." [14]

[13] Walter B. Waetjen and Robert R. Leeper, editors. *Learning and Mental Health in the School,* 1966 Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1966.

[14] Vernon R. Alden, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-53.

The Humane Person Defined*

Herbert A. Thelen

Herbert Thelen opens his discussion by pointing out that one can look at a person only in the context of the society in which he operates and the situation in which he finds himself. "Humaneness is a quality of experiencing or interacting. You cannot be humane all by yourself." This introduction is extended through an analysis of the concept of humaneness including enlightenment and compassion; and humaneness as caring from the standpoint of the worth of the person in the social situation.

In speaking of his earlier work, Education and the Human Quest, *Dr. Thelen speaks of his thesis that inquiry is the quality of activity through which individuals alone and together can face the confrontation of a complex world. "I still hold these ideas," he says, "but I can see that they are inadequate today because the con-*

*** Working paper developed in connection with the National Institute of Mental Health Research Project, "Use of Small Groups To Adapt Problem Students," University of Chicago, by H. A. Thelen, for presentation at the Leadership Conference on "Humanizing Secondary Schools," sponsored by the Secondary Education Council of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, St. Louis, Missouri, November 2, 1967.**

frontations of the real world don't 'grab' students, or present them with problems to solve."

Dr. Thelen then goes on to identify issues and to describe school projects which make programs relevant to young people's purposes and which promote humanistic qualities. He draws fourteen specific action alternatives within the caring process. He concludes his chapter with reference to the need for schools to be very much more effective, "not only in terms of each individual and his maturation, but also in terms of preparing people to take part in a society drastically different from the one we grew up in."—N.K.H.

I CANNOT define a humane person apart from his society and situation. I think we can characterize a humane *interaction,* but a humane *person* would only be the locus of a set of tendencies for interactions in his proximity that would have about them this quality of humaneness. To observe humaneness, one can only look at a person in the context of the society in which he operates and at the situation in which he finds himself.

Humaneness is a quality of experiencing or interacting. You cannot be humane all by yourself, as you may soon find out by trying to answer a paraphrase of Omar Khayyam Moore's delightful question: If you were all alone on the moon, with nobody to see you, what would you do to be humane? The fact that it takes a society to make humaneness possible, and the fact that society is changing continually, mean that interactions have to change. One suspects, therefore, that what we mean by humaneness—its significance, if not its labels—must likewise be changing.

The Concept of Humaneness

So there is a time index: "What do we mean by humaneness *today,* and what is its relevance for modern life?" Is humaneness today a central problem, a central concern, a central value—or is it only peripheral, a word to use in crossword puzzles?

Then, too, the *judgment* of humaneness has to be made by a person. The question of who would be concerned to make this judgment, and why, is intriguing. Why *does* the question of humaneness come up in the educational profession? Does it come up in other quarters as well? Is there something about the world today that suddenly makes this a universal concern?

I started my inquiry by looking up "humane" in the dictionary. The concept has two aspects. One is *enlightenment:* the humane person acts with wit, wisdom, openness to ideas; he inquires, he appreciates, and he knows man by his achievements, accomplishments, and aspirations. These characteristics distinguish man from the animals and are therefore humane. The humane person is a kind of superman; whatever it is that separates men from animals, he has more of it. Mass murder also distinguishes man from the animals, but this is *not* humane, for the second aspect is *compassion:* "having the feelings and inclinations proper to men; having tenderness and a disposition to treat other human beings and the lower animals with kindness." He has a sense of relatedness to other people in a compassionate way. Thus, there are really two themes—enlightenment and compassion.

While I was mulling over these words, I ran across an exciting definition, arrived at inductively by Rollo May. It appeared in an interview published in *Psychology Today.* I shall copy out a portion of it and we can see how well it fits a variety of events and happenings these days, and how well it clarifies what people may be really trying to tell us about humaneness. Rollo May, in one part of the interview, is quoted as saying:

> I think one of the myths that gave great dignity to America was the myth of the pioneer, the frontier myth. Lincoln, and even Adlai Stevenson, got some of that. Under the influence of this myth we learned to be strong, we Americans, and full of self-reliance. Now this was a sound myth and it led to progress and effort and optimism. But, it turned into the Horatio Alger myth, in which you succeed, no matter what your low beginnings, if you work hard enough and join the Rotary Club. That myth disintegrated, and Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman* marked the demise of the Horatio Alger myth. That play, which was written in 1948, shook my very depths. I knew my father's world was dead. That was the end of the myth that you could achieve an entity by being honest and being industrious. And now you can't. Even our work doesn't have meaning. . . . Take most of these hundreds of thousands of people down here [this refers to New York City]. They say, "Look, I do my work, I'm rich, I make money. I can't talk with my son. I don't know what to do with my money. I'm empty when I go traveling." Now my point is that the myths, the language, the symbols—whether these symbols are God or the Wailing Wall or success or devotion or even patriotism—are gone. . . .
>
> No, I'm not pessimistic. I think that out of an age like ours

> comes a new birth of symbols and myths that then become the center of the new society. I can see them taking form in modern art and in drama. . . . I call it a myth of care. I see this particularly in a drama like *Waiting for Godot.* Nothing happens in this play, two men are waiting, but they wait with hope and expectation, they wait with human fellowship. They share the turnip, the shoes, the ragged coat.
>
> The word *wait* means "to tend," in the sense of ladies-in-waiting. It has the character of believing in, a character of hoping for.[1]

I will not push May any further, but notice what he is saying. He is giving us a familiar plot-line: something disappears and something new takes its place. He is saying that now is a time when we can look for that emergence. What is it that will emerge? It will be the value of caring. Caring not only for each other, but for our common plight. I propose that as we bring forth other examples, we may consider these from the standpoint of caring.

Humaneness as Caring

Having some idea of what to look for, I decided to look around, listen, read things, go where the action is, and see how people act and talk. I would seek the places where the issue, if indeed there is one, of humaneness ought to be raised; and I would see what form it takes, who raises it, what it is like.

The Inhumanity of Not Caring. Most of my evidence comes either from *Renewal,*[2] a little review-type journal issued by the Chicago City Missionary Society, or from a magazine called *Transaction,*[3] published by the Community Leadership Project, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

Our first testimony is from an article called "Beyond Berkeley: High Noon on Campus." It considers the plight of university students. What it says about higher education has meaning, however, for high schools and even elementary schools. The author, Joseph Gusfield, says that we have a "meritocratic" society:

> The meritocracy is a society in which social position and economic position are gained on the basis of merit. There is a complete equality of

---

[1] Mary Harrington Hall. "An Interview with Mr. Humanist." *Psychology Today* 1: 28-29; September 1967. Copyright © 1967 by Communications Research Machines, Inc. Reprinted by permission.

[2] *Renewal.* 116 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60603. 10 issues per year.

> opportunity; positions are allocated on the basis of talent and performance, rather than inheritance or social advantage. In this society the educational system is the basic institution that attempts to sort and select personnel. . . . The student in this system is terribly afraid of making mistakes. His fear permeates his relationship with the new, terribly distant figures of judgment and hell-fire, the faculty. College administrators are always telling students to concentrate on grades. . . . The grade is of immense importance in a meritocratic society where vocation and future are of crucial importance to highly mobile students. There is little room in the life of the student for making intellectual mistakes; for taking courses which may not be related to a future.[4]

Students do not play any more, and our author goes on to say that they cannot be human beings, they cannot be spontaneous or find out who they are if they cannot play. One cannot really mature under the continual pressure of fear of making a mistake. The message is that we started out with a good idea, meritocracy (it was probably an act of genius in American democracy to make this a central point) but it is no longer adaptive for our students. They feel trapped in an anachronistic ideology. This is proposed as the basic condition to which the antics of protestors are responses.

Here is a comment from James Bevel, Southern Christian Leadership Council:

> The truth of the matter is that right now there is more work than we can do. The problem is that American business and our leaders are not leading people to work. They are leading people into games. Producing cars, couches, and coke is not necessarily work. Or producing guns and bombs. That is not work either. It is squandering our resources and brain power. We must develop a strategy to direct people to work. We talk, for instance, about the gap between East and West, the Chinese, Russians, and Americans. We do not know even how to speak to each other because we do not know the languages. So, we have a lot of work to do learning the Chinese and Russian languages, and nobody is really working on that. There are all kinds of good and useful work, but we are not doing that kind of work and it needs to be done.[5]

---

[3] *Trans-action.* Box 43, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 31330. 6 issues per year.

[4] Joseph Gusfield. "Beyond Berkeley: High Noon on Campus." *Trans-action* 2:4; March-April 1965. Copyright © 1965 by *Trans-action* Magazine, St. Louis, Missouri.

[5] "Responses to Theobald-Cloward from a Panel of Chicago Leaders." *Renewal* 3:21; May-June 1966.

So here is another anachronism. Production, which made us great and powerful, has become an end in itself, and our energies and resources are going into maintaining a traditional (but vastly expanded) kind of production—instead of adaptive work.

Organizations can be unresponsive because they are outmoded or because they are unenlightened. Consider this, by columnist Robert Raines:

> Eradicating rats, of course, would not eliminate riots. It would only suggest that somebody cared. The people in the ghetto have heard it loud and clear from our Congress, "We don't care about you and your children." There is much truth, I believe, in the charge that Congress is responsible for the riots. But that's still an evasion, for who is Congress but *You* and *I*? The simple truth is: We are responsible for the riots. We, the American people. *We* are responsible for engendering and encountenancing the conditions that drive people in our nation's cities to riot and revolt.[6]

Says the *New York Times*, "Slum dwellers are in revolt because the cities in which they are condemned to live have become unbelievable, unlivable, concrete, brick, and neon monstrosities, unfit for human habitation."

No sampling of the inhumane aspects of our society would be complete without a little tribute to what bureaucracy means when it hurts; and it hurts when you are poor. Here is a letter written by a mother of five children, on relief, and then some comments on it. She says:

> I got lots of choices. I can leave the lights burning all night to keep the rats away and have a big electric bill, or take a chance with the rats. I can spend the carfare to take the five kids to the clinic for a checkup, or stay home and hope for good health. I can tell the welfare investigator that my parents in Puerto Rico are dead, or tell her the truth and let my parents find out I never made it in the States.

Trans-action comments:

> These are the words of a welfare recipient living in Manhattan's lower East Side, collected on tape by Sherman Barr, Assistant Chief of Services to Individuals and Families at Mobilization for Youth. These people cope, somehow, with a welfare system so bureaucratic that it allows 90 razor blades a year for employed males; 12 haircuts a year for a man if he is working and 9 if he is not; 2 lipsticks a year for a working woman, and 1 for an unemployed woman. Barr states that they believe they are victims of an affluent society that can never understand

---

[6] Robert Raines. "Riots and Responsibility." *Renewal* 4:6; September 1967.

> their problems. They see the welfare agencies they deal with, with their paraphernalia of budgets, plans, coordination—as systems too sophisticated for them ever to master. The welfare system, itself, becomes to them a symbol of all that's cruel, unjust and illogical in a society. They are deeply estranged from the welfare institutions designed to help them.[7]

May I suggest that if we educators feel pretty smug about this, we should look at a typical slum school, and see what we think about *that.*

Now, as we try to get the feel of the times, there are some hopeful things; for example, a revolt of welfare workers in Cook County a little while ago. They went on strike, and they produced "A Manifesto for a More Humane Welfare System." It starts off this way:

> We, the members of the Independent Union of Public Aid Employees, are convinced that we are working within an essentially *inhumane* welfare system. . . . It is inhumane because it demands that large families live in small, decrepit, slum apartments, and refuses to let them pay enough rent to get decent living quarters. . . . It is inhumane because it makes very inadequate provision for immediate emergency assistance to persons who are in dire need. . . . We believe that our public welfare system does not have to be inhumane. . . . We believe that as the people in direct contact with the welfare recipients, we know more about their needs and about the flaws in our system than anyone else; and we want the right to deal directly with the administrative heads of the system in the interest of changing it. We are convinced that the paternalistic attitude, which has kept our salaries low and has kept us in constant suspense about what the administration intends to do about raising them, and the same paternalistic attitude which perpetuates intolerable conditions for our recipients, *must* be challenged and met head-on in direct negotiations.[8]

In industrial discontent, we find another theme: Labor is what you can program and do with a machine, and it is degrading for men to do it; work is what you do when you face the world adventurously, head-on. Here is an analysis by Robert D. Koth, a minister, who took a job for a while as a laborer, and then tried to tell what this had meant to him. He wrote:

> Some executives and union officials ask, "What does the worker

---

[7] "Voices of the Poor, Roundup of Current Research." *Trans-action* 3(3): 30; March-April 1966. Copyright © 1966 by *Trans-action* Magazine, St. Louis, Missouri.

[8] The complete manifesto appears on page 17, *Renewal*, August 1966.

> want? He has good wages, a cafeteria, insurance, paid holidays and vacations." He wants *a voice* in his work. He wants to be able to have something to say about what he does and how he does it. He wants *recognition*. He wants to feel that he has something important to contribute to the company. He wants *to belong* to the total organization. Keeping Negroes down in the low-paying, low-recognition jobs makes them feel like outsiders. He wants *responsibility*, corresponding with his willingness and ability to assume responsibility.[9]

This sounds familiar. It closely parallels the educator's remarks that the child is a whole child; he must be dealt with as an entire entity; his thoughts, feelings, and ability are all relevant, not just his memory and his verbal capacity. This "wholeness" that individuals want can be sought through group action. When this happens, we stop talking about individuals and say that it is the group that wants wholeness and recognition. Let us see what happens when a group, formed for this purpose, goes into action.

> The first week in June was declared Puerto Rican week by Mayor Daley [Chicago]. For a year Puerto Rican leaders had sought to build unity and strength in their community. Puerto Rican week was the result of that effort. A Puerto Rican spokesman said, "Hundreds of people are working very hard on this week. They want it to be beautiful. They want the American people to notice them." The President of a major Puerto Rican group, Carlos Ruiz, said, "Now they'll see we are somebody." . . . The week-long festival, held in Humboldt Park was well run, orderly, and great fun. The parade down State Street was beautiful. It was resplendent with beautiful floats, even more beautiful girls, and dignified, handsome men. It was one of the longest parades State Street had ever seen, lasting well over two hours.
>
> The whole effort illustrated the imagination and competence of the Puerto Rican community. . . . Press coverage was meager. The June 12th issue of the *Chicago Sun Times* carried a large picture of the police department band, with a caption indicating that it had played in the Puerto Rican parade. Other dailies gave even less coverage. In contrast, the riots [involving the same community during the same summer] received excellent newspaper and T.V. coverage. Expert reporters covered every angle; on-the-spot analysis of riot dynamics, interviews with leaders, and man-on-the-street bits. Ten thousand Puerto Ricans joyously marching down State Street wasn't news; ten thousand Puerto Ricans rioting on Division Street was news. Suddenly, the Puerto Ricans were *somebody*.[10]

---

[9] Robert D. Koth. "Reflections of an Erstwhile Common Laborer—On-the-Job Humanity." *Renewal* 4:20; February 1967.

[10] Art Vasquez. "A Puerto Rican Protest." *Renewal* 3:13; August 1966.

Some People and Organizations Do Care. A positive sign of caring is contained in a beautiful and eloquent comment by Jason R. Nathan,[11] New York City's Housing Czar. He describes a new housing project whose tenants range from welfare recipients to people paying a rent of $60.00 a room in the same building. The big pull of this building is that it is imaginative—it has fountains and water all around it, it is designed like a Day in Venice, or a Night on the Town, or some such thing. His point is that people like to live in decent places that are imaginative and humane; the fact that one condition for this is the mixing of social classes does not affect the harmony of their living there. It is nice to know that humans can respond to decency and excitement; and that you do not always have to do everything out of reaction and negativism.

I have a little note to myself about the Hippies. Like everybody else, I am fascinated by them, and I have talked with a few people who have interviewed them. They have tried drugs and various forms of annoying other people and rejecting the adult society; but now something stable seems to have emerged in the Diggers. What has emerged is people caring for each other regardless of their merit, regardless of whether they contribute anything to the common pot. The fact that they are there and that they are human entitles them to eat.

Thus a valuable element was generated out of mixed-up experimentation. It is the idea of caring—in the way a mother should about a child, unqualifiedly. (The father is often the one whose love is dependent upon achievement, on getting somewhere.) Where in our society do we have the equivalent of mother love? In schools we have plenty of love or reward contingent on "achievement," or doing what the teacher wants. But where in schools does the child get the sense that he belongs just because he is a human being?

One thing about fantasies, it costs no more to make them hopeful. Here is a pleasant one from a mental health worker, Elton B. McNeil:

> Let me tell you of an idle fantasy. At a cocktail party I once toyed with the notion that true community mental health might best be achieved by investing federal funds in mothers whose children have grown to maturity and no longer need their personal ministrations. I had in mind suggesting that the federal government install Princess telephones in the homes of these mothers and pay the monthly phone bill if they would daily call an assigned list of persons (old folks,

---

[11] James R. McGraw and Ben Reade. "A *Renewal* Interview with New York City's Housing Czar, Jason R. Nathan." *Renewal* 4:15; March 1967.

> delinquents, divorced mothers, recently bereaved, unemployed adolescents, physically sick community members, etc.) and talk to them about their problems.
>
> As the fantasy evolved and broadened, I decided MOM (Mothers on the March) would be an appropriate rallying cry. This plan seemed to be a double-edged problem solution. No-longer-needed mothers would feel needed once again, and they would be able to communicate with others in the community who felt their problem did not require the services of a psychiatrist, psychologist, or social worker.[12]

The idea of a "helping network" has cropped up in several places in recent years. The National Training Laboratory has, in a sense, a helping network of psychological associates. In Michigan a telephone network was set up to aid curriculum innovation; teachers can call and ask for advice from a teacher who has already used the new materials. Such networks try to put people who have mutual help to offer in contact with each other, without making a federal case of it.

Here is something so out-of-the-way that I have to include it. It is an advertisement in the *New Yorker* for October 28, 1967, page 205. If you want to be "in" you will have to care:

> This Christmas let your clients know how you really feel. What will you give your customers or clients this year? Another fancy basket of bottles and goodies? A gold-plated letter opener? Perhaps a set of steak knives. They're all safe enough, impersonal enough, and pretty much what everyone else will give. And when you stop to think about it, the whole thing will be forgotten by New Year's Day anyhow.
>
> Last Christmas, a New York advertising agency, Fladell, Winston, Pennette, did stop to think about it. Instead of another forgettable gift, each client received a letter explaining that the money was being contributed to Save the Children Federation to buy hope and a future for three Korean children in desperate need.
>
> Their clients' response was as unusual as the gift. Unanimously, they expressed approval and genuine appreciation for the contribution made in their names. . . .
>
> If you become a sponsor, your company will receive a photo of the child or children, and case histories. You can, if you wish, copy these documents and send them to your clients, along with year-round reports of the child's progress.[13]

It is smart to care!

---

[12] Elton B. McNeil. "How Healthy Can the Great Society Be?" *Transaction* 3(4):33; March-April 1966.

[13] Save the Children Federation advertisement. *The New Yorker* 43 (36): 205; October 28, 1967.

The Rosenthal Experiment. As a final bit of testimony, let us consider the consequences of caring. A person cared for is worth caring for, and the prophecy is self-fulfilling. Here is *Scientific American's* report on an experiment conducted by Robert Rosenthal at Harvard. This is straightforward evidence that caring really matters:

> A relatively non-verbal intelligence test, that was purported to predict imminent "blooming" or intellectual growth, was administered in a West Coast elementary school [through Lenore Jacobson, South San Francisco Unified School District]. In each of the 18 classes (an average, below average, and above average track in each of the six grades) about 20% of the children were reported to their teachers as being likely to show unusual intellectual gains in the coming year. Actually, the names had been picked by means of a table of random numbers.
>
> The children were re-tested eight months later, the tests were scored by the investigators, and the change in IQ for each child was computed. As Rosenthal and Jacobson first reported in *Psychological Reports* in 1966, for the school as a whole the supposed bloomers showed a mean gain of 12.2 points compared with 8.4 for the control group. The effect of expectations was greater in the lower grades than in the upper grades. The "bloomers" in the first and second grades gained respectively 15.4 and 9.5 points more than the control children. The effect was more striking (and more independent of age) on the "reasoning" than on the "vocabulary" portions of the test; it was about the same, regardless of "track" level.
>
> Teachers were also asked at the end of the year to describe their pupils. They characterized the "bloomers" as having a better chance of becoming successful; as being significantly more interesting, curious, and happy, and as somewhat more appealing, adjusted, and affectionate. Curiously, those control-group children who gained in IQ were not rated this favorably by their teachers; in fact, the more the undesignated children, particularly the slow-track control children, gained in IQ, the more they were regarded as being *less* well adjusted, interesting, and affectionate. Rosenthal and Jacobson point out that their findings, which have been supported in subsequent studies, may bear importantly on current efforts to improve the education of children in city slums.[14]

Old hands at this racket have known for years that the old put-down crack "all you're doing is capitalizing on the Hawthorne Research," is exactly what we *are* trying to do. The Hawthorne effect *is* the sense of being cared for, and it is the *main* effect. The other things we do are just to produce the Hawthorne effect.

[14] From "Science and the Citizen." *Scientific American* 217(5):54; November 1967. Reprinted by permission. Copyright © 1967 by Scientific American, Inc. All rights reserved.

Finally, a confession from one who cares. Writes Malcolm Boyd:

> I had to learn a good deal about the freedom movement itself. At first, I quite seriously called it the integration movement. I thought that was the point. When I embarked on a freedom ride, and other related activities, I was acting paternalistically to "help Negroes."
>
> What a devastating moment of truth awaited me! *I* needed help. *I* needed to explore the dynamics of interior and social freedom. *I* wasn't a free person, for I dwelt in a nation where freedom was not yet a reality, but only a goal. So, I learned how the freedom movement existed not to incorporate disenfranchised people into a middle-class affluent way of life, but to restructure the way of life itself.[15]

Enough, then, of such testimony. I think we may take it that people want to care, they want to be cared about, they want to be cared for. Caring includes being allowed to live like a human being. Caring is the circumstance that makes humanization possible, and without it we are at the level of brutes.

Social Basis for Caring or Not Caring. Now I would like to consider what processes of society brought about the present state of affairs. I think any society swings back and forth between two limiting situations which represent different bases of psychological security and different sources of hope and inspiration. First, in a group, classroom, company, or society, when goals are clear, when action alternatives exist, when new ideas are being generated, when there are new frontiers to conquer—at these times individuals are swept along purposefully in their roles as producers and members. Morale is high. At the national level, we recall the fighting of World War II (which we thought was a just war) and the rebuilding of Europe; at more local levels, the action projects which set up new communities, and the rebuilding of certain community schools in the South during the 'thirties. These were periods during which *structure* was being created—structure of organizations, laws, policies, new knowledge.

As more and more aspects of life become defined, as more structure is developed, the individual begins to have less openness of choice, less autonomy, and, therefore, less sense of worth; and this is hard on individuals who come along later, not having had a hand in setting up the system. They feel the system to be oppressive and they see it as devoted primarily to maintaining its own procedures (as in today's schools). The old timers seldom refer to the larger, long-range goals that originally justified their habits. Rewards are more and more confined to the operators (the "Establishment") of what has become a processing machine, and others become increasingly alienated. Persons both central and peripheral feel that something drastic ought to be done, but everything has become so tightly enmeshed and locked in together that nobody can figure out a reasonable alternative. (And here we are, 1967.)

---

[15] Malcolm Boyd. "Freedom Means Black Power." *Renewal* 3:9; August 1966.

At times like this, when the formal organization has failed, *the informal organization of society takes over*. People reach out to each other, they express their sense of desolation, of emptiness, possibly of disgust, rejection, and alienation; they communicate across interage, intergroup, interpersonal boundaries. The college student, enveloped in a pointless educational institution, makes common cause with oppressed Negroes because they have fellow feelings, and share the same plight. New ideas, values, and movements emerge out of the crucible of spontaneous humane person-to-person interaction. The central quality of this humane interaction is caring, the bootstrap condition through which we must now raise ourselves out of our present stalemates in so many areas of life.

Now how do the schools fit into this picture? To begin with, what happens in school is part of what happens in society. What I have just described in broad terms very well fits what has happened in schools as they moved from the humanitarian, open, inquiry-oriented, autonomy-seeking operations of the depression years to the inhuman, manpower-oriented, factory operations of the present. There has really been a shift in the schools away from humanitarian concepts to manpower concepts, from "whole" child to competitive producer. And the more the product has been specified in detail, the more people have been found wanting; and as this has given rise to more formal differentiation through tracks and counseling services, more students have come to realize in their hearts that they are failures. In short, the formal (non-caring) structure has won out over the informal (caring) structure.

For nearly 30 years I have thought that classroom inquiry should be the central value for schools to maintain, preserve, protect, and explicate. I was concerned with the *enlightenment* aspect of humaneness. In *Education and the Human Quest* [16] I presented inquiry as the quality of activity through which individuals alone and together could face the confrontations of a complex world. I still hold these ideas but I can see that they are inadequate today because *the confrontations of the real world do not "grab" students, or present them with problems to solve.* Confrontations are seen only as *symptoms* of the times' being out of joint.

---

[16] Herbert A. Thelen. *Education and the Human Quest.* New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1960. p. 224.

In other words, daily confrontations, while having some content of their own, are reacted to more as signs of the wrongness of something very deep and very difficult to identify. A genuinely confronting event inaugurates active soul-searching rather than only a passive sense of rejection, alienation, and depressive immobilization. The condition for soul-searching is that people have *compassion* for each other, they *care.*

One is not likely to make new discoveries in inner-space in the face of the indifference or coldness of others. One needs, as all need, sympathetic encouragement. We are "waiting for Godot," as Rollo May says, and to make this purgatory tolerable, we need the caring we can give to each other. We still need the skills, insights, and openness of problem solving, but in times like the present I can now see that these activities can be vital only within the context of a compassionate relationship, and not within the context of the Protestant ethic of competitive striving.

School Project in Caring

How may inquiry processes and compassionate relationships be brought together in classroom activity? I shall present an example. At the University of Chicago, we are in the middle of a five-year research, sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health, in which we try to help poor children who do not make it in the classroom. The teachers have picked out from the fifth and sixth grades the children that they think are having the worst trouble; and we have been taking them out of class to work with them. Our task is to discover and capitalize on the strengths that they have, rather than to concentrate on their weaknesses and to convince them that they are failures.

We have found a lot of things that work somewhat and one thing that works especially well; and by no coincidence, the central thing that makes it work is the caring relationship. The activity is students tutoring each other, and success has been reported from the work of Peggy and Ronald Lippitt in Detroit, of Mary Kohler in Newark; of the University City (Missouri) schools; of the mathematics staff in Overland Park (Kansas) schools; of the Plainfield Public Schools, in New Jersey. (I would like to hear from others.)

Here is a brief account of our tutoring activity: During the spring of 1967, pilot helping-experiments were carried on in the Laboratory School, Scott School, and Raymond School. In each school, one or two 15-man groups of fifth or sixth graders worked with first or second graders during four to six 30-minute to one-hour meetings. The activities included interviewing, teaching games, playing with puppets, reading aloud to one another, writing a story dictated by the younger child, the younger child copying the story as written by the older child, seeing a movie together and discussing it, demonstrating science experiments, occasionally drilling on simple addition, and so on.

The older children spent as much time with each other as they did with the younger children.

So, we have two kinds of caring: that of the older children for each other as they faced together the prospect of working with the younger children; and that of each older child working with a younger child. With each other, the older children prepared themselves to observe and interview the younger ones, discussed their teaching problems, role-played possible interventions (for example, how to handle the overactive or underactive first grader), practiced their lessons, worked up demonstrations and skits, and so on. The older children also received feedback from their performance with the younger children and, in same cases, were stimulated to private interviews with their regular teachers about the problems they felt they had in school.

Without exception, the teachers at both levels were helpful and interested. Some first-grade teachers helped train the older children to teach, telling them what performance levels were expected of first graders. Some fifth-grade teachers were interested in observing their own pupils in this new kind of situation, and some of them noticed very dramatic differences in role. The younger groups, without exception, were very eager to have the older pupils return. The older pupils, some of whom were initially resistant or fearful of the encounter, for the most part were gratified by the experience. There were several instances of older pupils outside the project trying to crash the program and take part. One girl went to the length of forging a letter from the principal requesting that she be allowed to participate in teaching first graders.

We of the research staff became enthusiastic about the way the project developed. We felt we had a healthy bull by the tail. Compared with other things we had tried, this tutorial experience "got to" the older and younger children. We found this was a natural action framework within which our ideas of inquiry were effective. Because there was a clear product, that is, performance as a teacher, it was easy to give feedback, identify problems, set up self-training activities, and so on. We felt the goals and methods were readily understood by the older children and that the skills required tapped their strengths rather than their weaknesses—that is, in some ways what we were doing extended the family pattern of the slum into the classroom and capitalized upon the children's familiarity with and acceptance of at least parts of that pattern.

Many of our subjects had been selected because they had very poor relationships with their peers. It was gratifying to see these pupils become responsible, serious, and warm in their relationship with the younger children. It was also interesting to hear these pupils make comments relating their experience as "teachers" to their own classroom experience with adult teachers. In some cases there is reason to believe they became better able to navigate in their own regular classroom.

As we reflect on these experiences, we believe that the helping process might be built into the schools at many points, ranging from older pupils with younger pupils to peers with each other.

Outcomes of the Caring Process in Schools

I would like now to show the wide range of ways in which the simple idea of two people caring for each other could permeate many aspects of the whole organization and open up exciting possibilities. Caring is not just a "technique"—it is a whole way of life! Here are some possible foci, sensitivities, or action alternatives within the caring process:

1. Developing a stronger sense of community within the school by cutting across grade lines, and by providing a common interest (teaching) in which students at many different grades can participate.

2. Reducing of cross-cultural, cross-generational, and authority barriers to communication.

3. Changing the climate of the school through its development of the norm of concern for each other; substituting proc-

esses of cooperative inquiry for the anxious competitiveness which at present distorts the children's perceptions of each other.

4. Enhancing the ego development and self-esteem of the children. The first successful experience of feeling wanted is highly dramatic, and can open the window to a new way of looking at self.

5. Letting the students see a new use for subject matter knowledge and thus assimilate it better and even come to want more of it. In the helping relationship, knowledge is the currency of interaction. It is not just the ability to pile up facts and hand them back on a test, nor to make deductions from chemical principles as to whether some reaction will go or not. We are talking about *humane* uses of knowledge: for having interactive stimulation, being able to dominate, being able to reach out and make contact with other people through talking about something.

6. Giving youngsters a chance to practice the adult role of teacher and to visualize the possibility that there may be a place for them in the productive society after all—a great discovery for non-achievement-oriented slum youngsters. (I admit that serving as "teachers" in a protected short-range situation is a very flimsy basis, but hope can spring from many sources, and maybe this will start something going!)

7. Offering leadership training to students in the hope that they may become indigenous leaders in their community.

8. Increasing by a large factor the amount of teaching going on in the school right now. This would not cost if schools would capitalize on some of the student resources they already have.

9. Individualizing instruction, on a one-to-one tutorial basis.

10. Giving the younger pupils a big brother or big sister who can guide them during the year. These are some of the things I especially want to find out about the helping relationship: Will the older child helping the younger, like the fifth grader helping the first grader, develop a relationship with so much pull, so much value to both sides, that it becomes semi-permanent? Will the older pupils want to find ways to maintain this relationship even outside of the formal activities—in other words, will they move into some kind of a spontaneously developing guidance system on the basis of voluntary choice?

11. Providing remedial resources pinpointed to the pupils when they most need help. It is one thing to schedule opportunity

for youngsters to get help, but what about having students available who can help in a crisis when the teacher has to keep on with the class?

12. Picking up cues for better teaching and management by watching the more successful "natural teachers" among our own students, especially when they come from backgrounds different from ours.

13. Realizing that the helping or adjunct teaching roles might also receive student teachers, parents, and helpers from the community.

14. One of the things that got us into this in the first place: using tutorial activity as a way to develop the child's own insight into the teaching-learning process so that he can cooperate more effectively with his own teachers in meaningful learning activities. That is, tutorial activity might contribute to the objective of the child's learning how to learn.

I have agreed with Rollo May and many other people that there are changes going on in the world around us; that we are coming to stalemate situations in which it is hard to find alternatives in some of the major areas of life; that, in times like this, human beings tend to turn to each other, rather than to the system, for comfort, counsel, and help; that the quality of this turning to each other, when it is effective, is what I will call caring; that this same quality, if injected into schools, might make them very, very much more effective—not only in terms of each individual and his maturation, but also in terms of preparing people to take part in a society which is drastically different from the one you and I grew up in.

The High School in Human Terms: Curriculum Design

James B. Macdonald

James Macdonald points out that in this chapter he does not create a specific proposal for a curriculum design. Instead, he presents a set of humanistically-oriented curriculum development principles after providing some background for deriving them. This he has done through:

1. *Discussing the major humanistic movements in Western man's history*
2. *Pointing out a major problem in the practices of schools arising out of their tendency not to embody in their programs such ideas as self-direction, self-discipline, and creativity*
3. *Relating three sets of conditions to humaneness:*
    - *a.* A priori conditions: *an understanding of physical growth, nutrition, and genetic lack or physiological damage as essential for providing the background for development of human potential*
    - *b.* Social conditions: *the framework by which the individual becomes human, but which are essentially closed in a nature. "Yet to develop his potential, a person must be open as a condition for human development and transcendence"*
    - c. Transcendent conditions: *some potentiality of human experience beyond the present status of the individual.*

True assertions about knowledge that are central to a humanistic curriculum, according to Macdonald, are these:

1. *Knowledge is uncertain, not certain.*
2. *Knowledge is personal, not impersonal.*
3. *Knowledge is functional, not inert.*

The problems of curriculum design are centered around this end—a human person who is committed to the value and worth of each and every human being as the central value of existence, who is aware of potentiality which lies within himself, and who is aware of the possibility of transcending his present personal and social situation and becoming skilled in the process.

Each of these problems is discussed fully with elaboration into operational goals.—N.K.H.

THERE are at least three major humanistic movements in Western man's history, and although they are not mutually exclusive in any sense, they are distinguishable from each other in emphasis by historical time and event. These humanisms are: (a) classical, (b) Christian, and (c) social(ist).

Classical humanism, springing from ancient Greece, finds its meaning in the liberal arts, the liberating arts. It is rational and reflective in character and focused upon freeing the individual by knowledge.

Christian humanism, on the other hand, is characterized by the concept of love. It is embodied in the quality of interpersonal response to human beings in a total, more than rational, manner.

Both classical and Christian humanism center upon the individual in relation to truth, which has the quality of an absolute. "Know thyself" and "Do unto others . . ." have become the symbolic phrases for these humanisms.

Classical humanism has been and is still sometimes reflected in the schools in the subjects that are studied for the freeing of the intellect. Christian humanism has been and sometimes still is reflected in the quality of loving in one-to-one relationships. Both have centuries of human tradition behind them.

Social humanism, as a formal force, did not appear in any dramatic form in history until the 19th century. Hegelian philosophy is often given as its root; its first explicit statement is in the writings of Karl Marx. Its modern development is found in the transactional interpretation of pragmatism and its existentialism.

Essentially social humanism reflects the concept of man's making himself in the process of being made in history. Thus, man is freed from absolutes to become almost unlimited in potentiality as he journeys through history—the molding of selves; and the transcendence of history is the remolding of each generation in newer, more human images; shaped by history, yet capable of shaping history.

In mundane terms, this means that social humanism as reflected in schools is found not simply in the offerings of liberating studies, or in the quality of interpersonal responses, but primarily in the creation of social conditions for fostering human beings. Thus, curriculum development becomes, as John Dewey [1] said, the creation of conditions for growth.

Curriculum and Instruction

On the curriculum level, as distinct from the instructional arena, this means primarily the creation of planned relationships between subject matter and materials, and broad organizational patterns, as the conditions within which the instructional acts take place.

There is, I think, considerable confusion between the concepts of *curriculum* and *instruction*. Often the two concepts are used interchangeably, as witnessed in Jerome Bruner's "theory of instruction," [2] which talks primarily of curriculum.

The two concepts seem to me to be obviously separate but interrelated. Instruction refers to the interactive context of the teaching-learning situation which takes place primarily in classrooms (or other "instructional areas"). The curriculum is both a plan and a set of constructed conditions within which instruction takes place. It is prior to instruction but is both more and less than instruction. It is more than instruction in the sense that instruction takes place within the curriculum conditions; but it is less than instruction in that it cannot include the quality of personality and interpersonal relations unique to individuals and groups that so obviously affect the learning that takes place in schools. The curriculum is thus a directive and a setting, but only a part of the instructional context.

---

[1] John Dewey. *Democracy and Education.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.

[2] Jerome S. Bruner. "Needed: A Theory of Instruction." *Educational Leadership* 20 (8): 523-32; May 1963.

Thus, humanism in the schools is more than humanism in curriculum, but at the same time highly dependent upon the humanistic conditions established in a curriculum framework.

The rejection of classical humanism as a model for curriculum means that curriculum is more than intellectually liberating subjects or disciplines. As a "course to be run" it includes the manner in which the course is run and the conditions of the course as well as the guideposts along the way. Thus, social humanism includes the creation of planned opportunities for encounters as well as the kinds of "things" to be encountered, and hence the organizational format of schools.

Further, social humanism could well borrow from Bruno Bettelheim the title that "love is not enough." Just as parents must create opportunities for a child's emotional growth beyond the free giving of love, so a humanistic school must create conditions beyond one-to-one relationships.

What this essentially means is that curriculum development is purely and simply a form of social planning which should be humanistic in its orientation. The only alternative to this is what may best be called the "accidental curriculum": a curriculum that is shaped and embodied by broad political and traditional forces outside the school, and implemented by a reactive scrambling in response to the flux of changing times.

The development of curriculum today is, in the sense of social humanism, quite accidental. The recent program developments in the disciplines illustrate this. Curriculum is being constructed by competing forces beyond the school's control, and beyond the control of integrated humanism. As humanists, we may retreat to liberating personal reflections or withdraw to unreflective interpersonal love; or face the responsibility of planning and implementing a humanistic curriculum, both in spite of and in response to the human situation.

Alienation: The Major Problem

In contemporary society, man is alienated from his work, other persons, and himself. In essence this means that men see themselves as separate from the fruits of their labor, their fellow man, and themselves. Our society is an objective society. We perceive ourselves, others, and products as "objects" of manipulation, not as subjects of or for activity.

As Everett Knight says:

> Man's inhumanity to his fellows seems to depend upon the extent to which he can succeed in regarding them as objects—objects which, in certain historical circumstances, may come to be identified with precision and which therefore may be manipulated.[3]

Alienation in the school is endemic. It is brought about by the odious conception of learning as the possession of something, and by the ways in which we structure relationships.

Alienation is systematically cultivated by our failure to accept the idea, of long historical existence, in our modern scientific society that to know something is to be able *to do* something. Even the scholar must be able to *do research* or to *do teaching* if he is to have any completeness in his knowledge.

Yet for most high school youngsters, to know means to possess something which one can only use in an examination, if at all. The reality of the matter is that the opposite is true. Knowledge is not received, it is made. As a possession, it excludes human intercourse. Knowledge as intention, choice of action, restores fullness.

The result of the alienation of knowing from doing is a massive intellectual apathy upon the part of large numbers of our students. The student knows that any attempt on his part to utilize the facts at his disposal (even if meaningful to him), or simply to react in some practical way would be contrary to the practices of his teachers. The self-organizing facts, however, which the student needs only to absorb, passively take him one step further toward alienation in the sense that the student is further shielded from the knowledge that he *is* only insofar as he *does*.

The alienation of self is easily seen in the practices of the school. Such ideas as self-direction, self-discipline, and creativity, all expressive of choice and responsible action in relation to knowledge, have been notably lacking in embodiment in school programs. It takes little thought to realize that programs which neither encourage nor reward these kinds of activity will be focused upon conformity and comparative awareness of each person as an object. This can only further the alienation of the student.

In the realm of social intercourse, we are no closer to the development of practices to lessen alienation. Most of our school policies and interaction procedures are caught in the realization that they are predicated upon the stable running of the bureaucracy and the production of needed personnel for society. In fact, we act as if the student has consented to give up his self-fullness for the products and roles of modern society, as though he even aspires to this. We act as if the student *is* what he possesses in quantity of ability and achievement rather than what he can *do*. We do not hesitate to separate the student as an object from his own physiological functions, social needs, personal desires, and interests in the context of bureaucratic or group norms.

---

[3] Everett Knight. *The Objective Society*. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1959. p. 112.

The Problem of Humanness

To develop human schools which do not alienate students demands the freeing of their own potential. The optimum development of human potential is related to three sets of conditions which have been called "the *a priori* conditions," "the social conditions," and "the transcendent conditions." Full opportunity for potential to develop is dependent upon the existence of all three sets of conditions, each in its own way.

The A Priori Conditions. A priori conditions are genetic and physical in character. An individual must possess an adequate genetic structure to develop humanness, must experience normal (for him) physical growth, and must have proper nutritional care throughout. The lack of any or all of these conditions will result in the thwarting of the development of human potential. These conditions are important to all animal life but are necessary before human potential may develop. They are "givens" which are basic but not specifically human in nature.

An understanding of physical growth, nutrition, and genetic lack or physiological damage is essential for providing the background of the development of human potential. Such understanding is considered here to be the necessary condition for developing potential and will be assumed as background in further discussion.

The Social Conditions. Human beings develop and are distinctly recognizable as such in the context of social relationships which involve the use of signs and symbols. Societies and cultures provide frameworks for the development of human beings. They teach the individual how to act, how to symbolize and conceptualize, and how to perceive himself and his environment.

In order to become at least minimally human, an individual must learn to interact with others and must operate through the prevalent symbolic system; and in the process, he must learn to "see" himself and his world as others see him. His basic quest is toward mastery of common understandings about status and roles, objects and ideas, himself and others.

The schools have centered their efforts upon formal social conditioning. Curricula represent the formal structures of the ways our society conceptualizes the world and the tools necessary to cope with these conceptualizations. The disciplines, as formal languages of discourse about reality, have formed the substance of curriculum; and symbolic skills, both linguistic and mathematical, have provided the process dimensions.

The manner by which the individual is "socialized" is also of great importance. The degree of understanding, love, acceptance, recognition, hostility, and aggression, for example, will have deep consequences upon his personality formation. So, the content of his world and the process which he encounters will be set by his particular social conditions.

The school as a social environment has a major impact upon youngsters. As Edgar Friedenberg has so aptly stated:

> It is idle to talk about civil liberties to adults who were systematically taught in adolescence that they had none; and it is sheer hypocrisy to call such people freedom-loving. A juror who saw no reason why he should not have to get written permission to use the lavatory until he was seventeen years old, and who put up with the embarrassment and delay of showing his permission to various teachers and students on hall patrol between his study hall and the convenience, is not, in my judgment, very likely to understand why the State Department must not be allowed to withhold passports on political grounds.[4]

So, one might assert, it is idle to talk about humans who are self-directed, curious, creative, and self-fulfilling when they have been taught by the nature of curriculum tasks and conditions that they either should not be or are not able to be any of these things.

Social conditions are minimal conditions. They provide a framework by which the individual becomes human. They are, however, essentially closed in nature. No matter what the structure of a specific culture may be, the individual is closed in its symbolic universe and world view, its customs and mores, its functions and objects.

Thus, the basic problem of developing human potential appears. In order to be human, one must experience the closure of the socialization process. One is taught what it is appropriate to be curious about; what things exist and what they are called; how one manipulates these objects of attention symbolically and physically; how one may maintain one's personal integration in this culture (often via defense mechanisms); and how one should perceive and interact with others. Yet, to develop his potential, a person must be open, and it is openness which provides the maximal conditions for human development and transcendence.

---

[4] Edgar Z. Friedenberg. *The Dignity of Youth and Other Atavisms.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1965. p. 137.

The Transcendent Conditions. In order to become maximally human, each person must be able to transcend the limitations of his self-image and world view developed within the specific cultural context of his experience. Transcendence may have religious import, yet by no means does the term rest only upon relationships with some supernatural force beyond man. It does, however, always refer to some potentiality of human experience beyond the present status of the individual.

A friend of mine attributes to Margaret Mead a wonderful example of this phenomenon in a description of a group of Australian aboriginal children in a reform school. One of the custodial staff, who had been a teacher, started the children in crafts and drawing. Suddenly one little boy shouted, "I see, I see! You don't draw it the way you *know* it is. You draw it the way it *looks*." And (she says) the idea of perspective was born anew in his mind.

This example aptly illustrates the transcending of a construct learned in a social environment which opens up a whole avenue of potential development (in this case in relation to perspective in art) for the individual.

The process of transcendence may be likened to cutting holes in a beautiful cloth which encases us all so that new views may be perceived beyond the cloth which encapsulates us. In formal education the would-be hole cutter is knowledge—of self, of our cultural forms of knowledge, and of the potentiality for transcendence. Each student must then pursue a continuing enlargement of his view of his self-image, his world, and his potentiality.

The essence of encapsulation is to offer one approach to reality as if it were *the* approach. This is essentially what we do in our subject matter and in our social arrangements in school. However, *the most important way to escape encapsulation is through the cultivation of the student as an agent for creating knowledge through his acts of choosing and doing.*

The schools, when focused upon transcendence, would be concerned with creating contradictions or contrasts to expectancies now held by students in the various areas of personal and cultural knowledge. This is much like the theory of cognitive dissonance proposed by Festinger, and the educational procedure of the dissonant mode of clarification supported by James Raths, as well as Richard Suchman's Inquiry Training Approach.

The contradiction, however, must not be too great, and assessing a "readiness" for contradiction must be an integral part of the procedure.

Education from this perspective is not a matter of building new learning into students, but a process of enlargement of reeducation (if you wish) through appropriate contradictions of present expectations of reality.

Two general areas of knowledge which are contradictory by "nature," when utilized as means rather than ends, are the historical and cross-cultural dimension of knowledge and the study of the nature of language, especially semantics.

Beyond this the comparative analysis of common phenomena in the world about us, utilizing the different discourses or disciplines of knowledge, would provide a wealth of situations for contradictions to occur. The study of man has physical, biological, social, cultural, historical, linguistic, statistical, geographical, and other ways of talking.

The Problem of Knowledge

The curriculum in any formal educational setting will be infused throughout with knowledge. It is, however, extremely important that we clearly grasp the humanist tradition about the nature of knowledge in order to deal intelligently with curriculum design.

There are, it seems to me, three assertions about knowledge that are central to a humanistic curriculum. These are:

1. Knowledge is uncertain, not certain.
2. Knowledge is personal, not impersonal.
3. Knowledge is functional, not inert.

Uncertainty. No knowledge is certain. All knowledge reflects the structure of reality as we presently perceive, observe, and symbolize it. Perception, observation, and symbolization are, by their presently human nature, imperfect processes.

Authority for these assertions may be seen in the statements of leading scholars in the philosophy of language, by semanticists, physiologists, biologists, and theologians (among others). The evidence for this assertion may be found in presently held principles or concepts in the various fields.

Thus, for example, in physics the principles of uncertainty, relativity, probability, and complementarity are central to modern theory. Particles, in microcosm, are not predictable except by probability; observations are always relative to the observer; and both wave and particle theories of light, though mutually exclusive, are necessary and complementary in explaining the phenomena of nature.

Even in the mathematical world of pure logic, it has been shown that it is possible to formulate purely abstract theorems which cannot be shown to be true or false. As Bronowski says, "There are theorems which may or may not be true; and there are states which might or might not be reached; that mathematics can never decide." [5]

Personal Referent. All persons have what Michael Polanyi [6] calls tacit powers as well as an explicit power for knowing. Explicit powers are those articulate and logical abilities we prize so highly in the school.

The student encounters learning to articulate and reason systematically as a total experience in school. In order to make sense out of his experiences he must use his tacit powers for knowing. Nothing that is said, written, or printed can ever mean anything in itself; for it is only a *person* who utters something—or who listens to it or reads it—who can mean something *by* it. And all these semantic functions are tacit operations of the person, i.e., knowing what is *intended,* what is *meant,* what is being done. These operations all take place "in our heads" and not in verbal or written symbols. All knowledge is thus personal in the sense that it is shaped and sustained by our tacit or inarticulate mental abilities.

[5] Jacob Bronowski. *Common Sense of Science.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1953.

[6] Michael Polanyi. *The Logic of Personal Knowledge.* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

Functional Aspects. What Whitehead called "inert" knowledge is valueless. If we consider only the articulate and reasoned aspects of knowledge we are still faced with the problem of use. The scientist's knowledge is irrelevant to the school or society if he is unable to teach or do research. What, thus, are students to *do* with what they learn? Are all students learning content so that they will teach it? Do research? Or what?

Broudy, Smith, and Burnett[7] suggest four uses of school knowledge (replicative, associative, applicative, and interpretive). Should students learn mainly a set of skills to be applied replicatively in later life? Or should learnings be mainly for associative recall of concomitant data upon cues? Or should schools focus upon problem solving, the applied use of knowledge to solve social problems?

I would argue with the authors that none of these is appropriate as a major goal for high schools. I accept their position that the interpretive use, which primarily gives orientation and perspective for helping perceive, understand, and feel life, is the appropriate use.

The major point is, of course, that knowledge is for *using,* not for filling human containers.

The Problem of Society

The society we live in is a basic referent for curriculum. It may, in fact, be said to be the primary referent if we look closely at how schools now function. It takes little sophistication to note the social uses of schools in the production of role players for our contemporary economic, political, and national security needs.

Our schools as a sub-system of the general social system have predominantly a maintenance function. They are the formal organizations which provide society with trained personnel in order that the society as a system may continue to function. As such, the schools are conservative. They are organized to conserve and pass on the traditions and knowledge needed in the society at large.

The central questions become: What aims are crucial to the conservative purpose, and how does one proceed toward these ends?

---

[7] Harry S. Broudy, B. Othanel Smith, and Joe R. Burnett. *Democracy and Excellence in Secondary Education.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1964.

There is, it seems to me, no necessary natural form of human political arrangement. All forms of government historically and contemporarily are manifestations of the potentiality of human beings. Educational institutions, it follows, are quite legitimately variable also.

Our society, however, contains within it in some form nearly all human values that have developed throughout western civilization. Thus, we have not only radical leftist and rightist values, but a broad spectrum of middle positions. The crucial element here is not the selection of a position within this spectrum, but the recognition of the existence of the total range of values. The schools, by this perspective, can best conserve when committed to the totality of human values rather than to a single pattern or alternative. Thus, to conserve from a humanistic viewpoint means to conserve human values in our culture, and not to conserve *only* those values which are directly functional in everyday political, social, and economic life.

Clearly then, what I am saying is that the conservative commitment to schooling must be to a broad range of human values if we are to serve the democratic values of our society. This means, then, that the schools are committed to human values over and above narrower nationalistic ones, because of the unique political human adventure that the United States represents.

Universities in our culture have held a sometime commitment to this view. That is: The commitment to universal human values rather than to particular societal variants or alternatives. I shall assert that a humanistically oriented school, at any level, must hold this position. Further, I shall reiterate my argument by rephrasing it.

Few other countries today can allow universal human values to serve as the basis for their educational systems. The United States is in no danger of losing its particular value ethos—the consumer society. But this country has within its very fabric the values of freedoms which extend beyond national boundaries. These freedoms are what the schools must conserve, and must do so by being humanistically oriented.

The specific issue of humanistic versus particularistic aims may be phrased in the specialist versus generalist controversy of today.

There can be no doubt that our complex technological civilization needs highly trained specialists. Yet there is rampant nonsense abroad about the school's role in specialists' preparation.

It is my opinion that the majority of claims made upon the school and the majority of school practices evolved to meet these pressures for the preparation of specialists are primarily fronts for other social purposes.

As numbers of people are increasing, the need for the number of highly trained specialists is decreasing proportionately. The vast majority of executive industrial positions, for example, do not call for special training in school. I propose that an intelligent, ambitious, energetic, and achievement-oriented high school graduate can learn quickly on the job to do nine-tenths of the jobs reserved today primarily for college graduates.

I further propose that at least 50 percent of our present specialist training, for medicine, engineering, teaching, or what have you, is not based upon any rationally identified and justifiable analysis of specialist needs.

What we seem to have forgotten is that modern society inherited its school system; that it made the best of what existed; and that groups, agencies, and organizations have adapted their view of schooling to meet their own needs. Today we tend to see the schools as naturally formed for the purposes of modern society. This is, in a sense, putting the cart before the horse. Modern society has more nearly made a rational adaptation to its inheritance.

Most specialist needs are for people who look, act, think, and talk a certain way. What they need to know about specific functions is clearly much less crucial than who they are socially, or what they can potentially learn on the job.

There is, it seems to me, only one kind of specialism that truly necessitates the exacting training of the general nature now existent—that of the scholar and researcher. Further, this kind of specialism has no necessary requirement, other than opportunity to develop, at the high school level or below.

Clearly, the high school curriculum has been frozen in its present traditional form by societal groups that have adapted to this inheritance, and, having made the adaptation, are increasingly pressuring schools to become more effective and efficient at the job.

If schools were to educate for general perspective, which I shall argue for in a moment, then our societal agencies could adapt, as they have previously, to this form of education. Corporations, for example, might in the future have to establish their own education departments for the training of all sorts of workers in their organizations. This, I suggest, would be highly appropriate and desirable, for it would free the public schools for program development focused upon a general perspective of man and his human condition.

The Problem of Curriculum Design

A curriculum design for a humanistic school should be focused directly upon *the creation of conditions for fostering the development of human beings.* This should be its central intent, and its basic value premise.

The end, human persons, may be characterized as people who:

1. Are committed to the value and worth of each and every human being—as the central value of existence
2. Are aware of potentiality which lies within themselves, and the social, intellectual, physical, and emotional possibilities of their environment for furthering and creating potentiality
3. Are aware of the possibility of transcending their present personal and social situations, and are skilled in the processes of seeking transcendence.

A human being like this is not adjusted to a specific social pattern, nor embedded in his own neurotic defenses. Nor is he an intellectual specialist. Nor is he a technical and calculating problem solver adept at finding means to ends regardless of the end. He is, in other words, not greatly like the predominant models of "good citizens," "scholars," "technicians," or "professionals." Rather, we must face the reality that the price of humanism may be high, and it will come at the expense of certain materialistic, nationalistic, and contemporarily respectable occupations.

We would not wish, for example, to claim as products of a humanistic school, physicians who would deny adequate medical care for the aged under the aegis of "free enterprise." Nor to claim industrialists who prize money for the sake of making money rather than as an asset to spend for human life. Nor advertisers who work overtime to create a psychology of material greed, impulse buying, and irrationality for the sake of selling their products. Nor militarists who are willing to write off the horror, death, and disease of literally millions of women, children, and old people in Vietnam over the past twenty years (to say nothing of the slaughter of young men) for purposes that at best are unclear. These kinds of attitudes and actions would not be claimed as by-products of the ends of a humanistic education, for they all are examples of the denial of essential human worth for the sake of some social convention, personal gain, face saving, or other contemporary social reason.

I think what I am saying is that it is time the profession of educators quit apologizing for the values which, in most cases, turned them toward schools and schooling. I would venture to guess that most persons began teaching because they wanted to help humanity and to feel human in the process. Some have, of course, consequently sold out or given in to the pressures and seductions of affluence, prestige, power, and respectability. Nevertheless, if the preceding comments seem harsh or dogmatic, I can only say they are meant to be purely descriptive of conditions from a humanistic viewpoint.

The crucial concern of curriculum design, given the humanistic goals mentioned earlier, is to create the maximum conditions for the possibility of student humanization in the schools. In order to do this the goals must be translated into a series of operational definitions.

Goal number 1, the commitment to the value of each human being as central to existence, is most probably enhanced by the ways we relate ourselves, our materials, practices, and procedures to the student. Thus, it raises such crucial issues as policy, testing, routine, climate, and general organization.

Operational definitions in these areas would certainly include such things as the following:

1. All general testing programs (not now referring to teacher diagnostic tests or assessment for further instructional decisions) should avoid the violation of the privacy of individuals.

    a. No general test should be administered to any individual without his explicit choice to take this test, being aware of the purpose for it and of alternatives available to him; and within reason, at a time, place, and under the circumstances of his choosing.

    b. Predictive (ability) and personality tests should be used only in rare instances where decisions cannot be made, nor choices offered the student without such data.

2. Grading should more nearly be marking for the purposes of information to students. Reports to central offices should be in such a form that only at the request of a student would they be translated into units for such purposes as college entrance.

3. Reporting should be in a form of expository written sheets to students and parents, focusing upon progress in terms of strengths and weaknesses with positive suggestions for individual improvement.

4. All building policies, relating, for example, to movement, use of toilet facilities, tardiness, or absence, should reflect the idea that each student is potentially capable of making correct (for him) decisions about his own existence.

5. All disciplinary action should be predicated upon corrective alteration of student program and experience in order to alter school conditions in the life of the student that contribute to problems.

Much, of course, would still remain to be done on the instructional level and in the communication of support and positive regard for each person in all interpersonal relations in the school.

Goal number 2, the fostering of awareness of potentiality, and the awareness of environmental possibilities, requires something akin to a general education. Some operational definitions here might be:

1. Each person must be provided with a continuous opportunity to experience all areas of school-related study in a completely nonjudgmental setting and with complete freedom to choose in and out of situations.

Perhaps as much as one-third of each day should be organized for this "experiencing" activity. This would include experience in the community on a study basis, as well as experience in different disciplines and activities in the school.

2. Programs should be organized in such a fashion that the integration of knowledge is enhanced and recognized.

We must search for ways to identify not just the "structure" of the disciplines (which is a positive integration), but also the "structure(s)" of knowledge.

One promising metaphor that can be generalized into many areas is the concept of systems. Thus, the solar system can be understood in terms of objects and interactions between them. But, so can a sentence, or a political organization. If youngsters had a series of fundamental metaphors that could be utilized in all areas of content they could integrate their experiences with knowledge in the various disciplines more adequately.

3. Programs should be related to life as perceived by students.

All students should have many opportunities to study in community settings. This is not meant to suggest "vocationalism." It is meant to suggest a study of how knowledge is functionally integrated in real life. Thus, a classroom at a large department store would allow for the study of finance, mathematics, economics, sociology, history, philosophy, and science. The focal point of the study would be the total operating organization, a perfect example of the living integration of knowledge.

4. The central coordinating theme for high school programs should be the study of man: as scientist, as organism, as person, as role player, as dreamer.

The central theme should not be the products of science, social relations, and the like, but the human process.

I would suggest the possibility of organizing at least one-third of each of the four years of high school around the so-called social sciences, in an integrated core program format.

The final one-third of the program I would provide for depth study in all the disciplines, made available on a selective basis.

5. Programs should be so structured that those qualities of man that are characteristically human are continuously emphasized in action.

Man as a thinking, feeling, valuing, and symbol-creating being should be the heart of all activity in school.

In order to develop this curriculum, arrangements must be so organized that teachers show these qualities (as models) and students engage in these processes continually.

This means, of course, a heavy emphasis upon teacher behavior which displays thinking, expresses and struggles with values, expresses feelings, and demonstrates creative and playful manipulation of symbols. Students should be engaged with teachers in these activities.

Goal number 3, awareness of possibilities to transcend the immediate personal and social situation, would suggest such operational definitions as the following:

1. Students should be given every possible opportunity to clarify their values in relation to themselves, others, and content.

Three kinds of things are suggested here: (a) adequate counseling services; (b) close personal relationships with at least one teacher; and (c) building in-group value clarification discussions as an integral part of *all* subject matter activities.

The latter has most promise, I believe, for the opportunity to realize the variety of perceptions and their value implications in relation to the "same" content, and would be crucial for enlarging one's view of human potential.

2. All content or subject matter should be taught with principles of semantics in operation.

The single greatest contribution of 20th century man to posterity may well be our increased understanding of how language and symbolization function in human existence.

Aldous Huxley[8] has remarked that the greatest weaknesses of current systems of formal education are: (a) the failure to give students an understanding of the nature and limitations of language; and (b) the failure to take into account the fact of human variability.

In other words, all instruction must make provisions for recognizing the symbolic process as a technique or means for conceptualization, not as an end in itself (the word is not the thing).

At very least, students should receive preparation in semantics (more preferably continuous use in all areas); and should have foreign language experiences which develop semantic implications.

3. All content and problems should be taught in light of their historical and cross-cultural perspective.

Just as semantics frees men from being trapped by language, history and anthropology free men to realize the social location of ideas, and give men the opportunity to visualize a variety of patterns.

History and cross-cultural variance should be an integral part of all instruction.

4. Every possible opportunity for nonverbal education and expression should be encouraged in the curriculum.

People build their conceptual learning on basic perceptual models. Our perceptual sets appear to precede much concept development. Freedom to learn and to realize potential may be more nearly achieved by perceptual training than by conceptual activity.

We occasionally get glimpses of the world of nonverbal potentiality. (Perhaps in a report on LSD users, or in studies on autosuggestion or hypnosis.) There is, for example, at least reason to hypothesize that the problems of culturally deprived youngsters in our schools may well be grounded in perceptual "sets."

---

[8] Aldous Huxley. "Human Potentialities." In: *The Humanist Frame.* Julian Huxley, editor. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1961.

The point is that our schools are almost completely verbal in nature, and that no educational program can possibly touch the heart of human potentiality without facing the nonverbal educational needs of mankind.

In conclusion, what I have attempted to do did not result in a specific proposal for a curriculum design. Instead I hoped to present here a set of humanistically oriented curriculum development principles, after providing some background for deriving them.

Any number of specific patterns might be developed within the orientation provided here, and it would seem to me that this approach is within the spirit of the humanistic conception presented.

The "sane school," to paraphrase Erich Fromm,[9] should be characterized by diversity of goals, patterns, and opportunities—allowing all aspects of humanness to develop. It should be characterized by an ethical concern for students, to be of *service*, to be *just*, to be *authentic*, and to be *beautiful* (physically and psychologically). It should be as concerned with processes and the uses of knowledge as it is with the forms and content. It should be a vital, living, and fulfilling continuum of experiences for students.

In curriculum development, as in most aspects of life, it is a mistake to give up fullness for correctness, to substitute forms for processes, passivity for activity, for, as someone once remarked, "there are no wise virgins."

[9] Erich Fromm. *The Sane Society.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1956.

Bibliography

Harry S. Broudy, B. Othanel Smith, and Joe R. Burnett. *Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1964.

This book comes closest in spirit to the position of this chapter. A strong statement for general education with emphasis on the interpretive use of knowledge. An interesting and fairly detailed plan is presented which is unique and highly suggestive.

Lawrence W. Downey. *The Secondary Phase of Education.* Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Co., Inc., 1965.

An attempt to construct a conceptual scheme for ordering knowledge about secondary education is presented. This scheme, Downey believes, could serve as a systematic guide for innovation and curriculum change. This gives a very useful and insightful description of the nature of factors to be accounted for.

Gail Inlow. *The Emergent in Curriculum.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Excellent as an overview of new developments and old problems we tend to forget. A strong statement of the importance of the reflective and creative abilities of the young over and against the present major emphasis on pure cognition.

Arthur King and John Brownell. *The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

An extremely competent job of presenting the subject matter approach, in terms of the classical humanistic orientation. This book should be read by all persons because it is the only fully developed statement of this position.

J. Cecil Parker and Louis J. Rubin. *Process as Content.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1966.

A small and stimulating statement which treats process as content. Full of suggestive ideas for those who wish to face up to the contemporary need to reorganize our ideas of content. Fits very nicely with the social humanistic proposal suggested.

Achieving Humaneness: Supporting Research

Robert S. Soar

Robert Soar reviews early research on teacher effectiveness and agrees with those reviewers who have concluded "that if all the research of the preceding twenty years were wiped out overnight, the effect on education would be very little; and that the results of most of the studies can be summarized in terms of one general hypothesis, "nothing makes any difference."

He views the research since 1960, however, as changing radically from earlier forms and as showing positive relationships in both pupil achievement growth and attitudinal changes.

Dr. Soar reviews this recent research by citing Flanders, Hughes, Bellack, Gallagher and Aschner, Sanders, Amidon, Furst, Perkins, Fowler, LaShier, Torrance, and others. These newer approaches have focused primarily on the social-emotional aspects of teacher-pupil behavior in the classroom. Each is complementary to the other and apparently is standing the test of replication.

Dr. Soar reports his own extensive analysis of relations between teacher-pupil behavior and pupil growth. The findings from his own research support the hypothesis that a "more indirect, more open, more supportive style of teacher behavior does increase pupil growth. In addition, the increased growth goes beyond subject *matter, and includes more favorable attitudes and increased creativity." These findings are interpreted with necessary qualifications as supported by his own and other research.*

This paper makes a strong case in support of the argument for an open environment as a means of achieving optimum growth toward the humane goals of the school.—N.K.H.

UNTIL recently, the educational researcher has been of very little help to the educator concerned with the nature of the classroom which supports pupil growth.

Early Research on Teacher Effectiveness

I suspect most readers are aware of the fate of the variety of studies which have examined such teacher behavioral characteristics as permissiveness in relationship to consequences to pupils. Perhaps Brookover's study (1945) will suffice as an illustration. In it, he examined the relative amounts of subject matter gain shown by pupils in the classrooms of teachers who differed with respect to the emotional climate in their classrooms. He found that there was significantly greater achievement gain for pupils in classrooms where the emotional climate was less supportive than there was for pupils in classrooms where the emotional climate was more supportive. That is, the negative emotional climate produced the most growth. Probably most of us would have difficulty accepting these results at face value, and would propose numbers of hypotheses for why the results did not conform to expectations.

Other studies which have related various kinds of ratings of teacher effectiveness to objective measures of pupil gain have generally failed to find significant relationships. Medley and Mitzel (1959) reviewed this literature and concluded that the most consistent finding was one of no relationship or no differences. The comment of Arvil S. Barr, shortly before his death, is widely known: that so far as he could see, the 40 years of research at Wisconsin on this general topic had produced very little of use. Other reviewers have commented variously that if all the research of the preceding 20 years were wiped out overnight the effect on education would be very little, and that the results of most of the studies can be summarized in terms of one general hypothesis, "nothing makes any difference."

Probably the most incisive summary of the status of research on teacher ratings in relation to pupil growth is that of Medley and Mitzel (1959):

> Perhaps it is a bit unreasonable to expect a supervisor to tell how much a class is learning just by looking at it. The notion that he can do so seems to be based on two assumptions: that there is a pattern (or set of patterns) of behavior exhibited whenever optimum pupil learning takes place, and that the supervisor can recognize this kind of behavior when he sees it. . . .
>
> If there are uniform ways in which teachers and pupils behave whenever the pupils are growing in reading skill, they are not readily apparent to reasonably sophisticated classroom visitors. Raters of teacher effectiveness must seek subtler cues than these. There is no indication here of what these cues may be. . . .
>
> The problem of relating behavior of teachers to effects on pupils is crucial not only to further research in teacher effectiveness, but to the future of teacher education itself. If the main objective of the professional part of teacher education is to teach teachers how to teach, it is highly desirable (to say the least) that clear-cut research evidence be obtained showing how the teacher must teach in order to bring about optimum pupil growth, and that such findings be made a part of every teacher's preparation. The amount of research, completed or under way, which can yield such evidence is, to repeat, astonishingly small (pp. 244-45).

Recent Research

Since about 1960, however, the nature of the research findings has changed radically. Probably the milestone in this shift is the finding reported by Flanders in 1960 of significant positive relationships between teacher behavior, as measured by his observation system, in both pupil achievement growth and more favorable attitudes—a finding which has stood the test of replication.

It seems clear that this change in the nature of research findings has paralleled the increasing use of methods for systematic observation in the classroom (the term *systematic observation* as used here implies some relatively objective method for observing and measuring the behavior of the teacher and the pupils in the classroom). Probably a strong supporting element in this development has been the increasing availability of means for automated data processing and intensive statistical analysis which has made possible the examination of complex interrelationships on a scale which was not previously feasible. Logically, however, systematic observation is the prior development, and almost certainly the more important.

Probably the best known of the early systems were the Observation Schedule and Record published by Medley and Mitzel in 1958 (but without relationships to pupil growth), and the system of Interaction Analysis developed by Flanders, published in 1960, but more readily available in the 1965 monograph. Both of these were systems which looked primarily at the social-emotional aspects of teacher-pupil behavior in the classroom, as did another early system by Hughes and others (1959). Other investigators during this period were also developing means for measuring the cognitive level of thinking represented in classroom discourse, and the instructional strategies of the teacher in presenting subject matter. Included among these are the works by Bellack and others (1963, 1965), Gallagher and Aschner (1963), and Sanders (1966).

These latter were primarily descriptive studies, whose goals were those of finding ways of measuring and describing the nature of classroom interaction.

In general, however, the results from these studies strongly support the need for conferences such as the one at which this paper was first presented. As an example, Hughes reported:

> The most conclusive and pervasive functions performed by the teachers were in the category of "Controlling." The teachers directed the children in what they should do and how they should do it; what they should answer and how they should answer. The extent to which children can explore ideas, reach out in their experience and on their own, is very limited under controls of the kind presently exercised. In approximately two-thirds of the 129 records, the control functions performed by the teachers exceeded 40 percent of all teaching acts. . . . Teachers also control through the use of functions of Negative Affectivity, that is, with the use of reprimands, admonishments, threats, and accusations. . . . A significant finding reviewed the teacher's low use of Functions That Develop Content. From our frame of reference this means response to the data which children place in the situation. . . . More importantly, however, this also means the kinds of responses from teachers which seek the expansion and association of ideas, which ask for comparisons and inferences, which relate to personal experience and opinion. It is through such interactions that children are invited to use a variety of mental processes.
>
> Three-fourths of the 129 records examined contained functions in this category (Functions That Develop Content), amounting to less than 20 percent of the total functions performed by teachers. This fact takes

> on added meaning when we see that this category includes those acts in which the teacher serves as a resource to the child's questions, and the teaching acts of evaluation.
>
> It was possible to group the three categories of Controlling Functions, Teacher Imposition, and Functions of Negative Affectivity as a Dominative Behavior Index. The Functions That Develop Content, Personal Response, and Positive Affectivity were grouped as an Integrative Behavior Index.
>
> The excessive use of Dominant Functions was demonstrated by the fact that 80 percent of all records showed that the teachers were dominative in over 50 percent of their total teaching acts. . . .
>
> Approximately three-fourths of the teachers had 40 or less percent of their total teaching acts integrative. . . .
>
> A definition of good teaching within our framework of functions performed in the classroom requires a *reduction* in the number of Controlling Functions performed. The power component of the teacher should be ameliorated with the overt statement (Public Criteria) of the reason for a direction or command. Reduction of the Controlling Functions does not mean the teacher is less responsible for the teacher-learner situation as one properly managed for the business of learning. It does mean more efficient management and more opportunities for children to become increasingly responsible for their own learning. No one can learn for another (pp. 289-95).

Flanders comments that a surprising amount of classroom interaction is described by what he calls "the two-thirds rule," that about two-thirds of the time in the classroom somebody is talking, that about two-thirds of the talk is teacher talk, and that about two-thirds of the teacher talk is direct. Bellack describes the primary activity of the classroom as one in which the teacher's role is to solicit a response from pupils, the pupil's role to respond, and the teacher's role to evaluate the response. Gallagher and Aschner and Sanders all comment in their reports on the infrequency with which the thought level of the classroom rises above the lowest identifiable level—the transmission of rote facts.

Certain phrases come to mind as descriptive of classrooms in these studies. The teacher control behavior seems to be essentially what Thelen, in another context, has called "toilet training"; and the intellectual level of the classroom what a former colleague described as "fact mongering." Somehow it seems perversely reasonable that a high level of teacher control and a low level of cognitive activity should be associated. Indeed, as some of our data to be described later indicate, there is a kind of agreement of function here. And perhaps it will seem intuitively reasonable that it would be difficult for the pupil to engage in inquiry or to deal with abstractions and concepts in a situation under which he is closely directed and highly controlled.

Parenthetically, one of the questions raised by this description of the typical teacher role is the question of the changes that may come about as automated learning activities become more widespread in classrooms. It seems reasonable to assume that the function which automated teaching processes will assume most readily is that of communicating information and this raises the question of what role the typical teacher will then have. Hopefully, one of the possibilities may be that the teacher will be freed to direct more of his activities toward humanizing relationships with pupils in the classroom. The question then becomes one of how this can be arranged. Some of the research to be reported later in this chapter offers hope that this may, however, be a viable possibility.

Current Findings on the Relationship of Teacher Behavior to Pupil Growth

The number of studies which have related teacher behavior, measured by systematic observation, to some degree of change in pupils is limited. Nevertheless, the results from the several studies reported are consistent enough to indicate findings of some importance. As was mentioned earlier, a milestone in this research was Flanders' publication in 1960 of the finding of significant positive relationships between teacher-pupil behavior as measured by his system of Interaction Analysis, and both pupil achievement growth and favorableness of pupil attitudes. Since his category system has been used in a number of studies which will be reported here, this system will be described briefly.

The Flanders system of Interaction Analysis (Flanders, 1965) is concerned only with the verbal interaction of teacher and pupils. All interaction is identified by one of ten categories: seven of the categories reflect teacher activities; two, pupil activities; and the last, a miscellaneous category of silence and confusion. Four of the teacher categories are labeled *indirect influence:* they tend to support and to expand freedom for pupils. They are "Accepts Feeling," "Praises or Encourages," "Accepts or Uses Ideas of Student," and "Asks Questions." Three of the categories are labeled *direct influence* and they tend to direct pupils, to restrict freedom, to convey a negative, affective tone. They are "Lecturing," "Giving Directions," and "Criticizing or Justifying Authority." The two pupil categories distinguish between student talk in response to the teacher and student talk which represents an initiation of an idea or a question by the pupil.

In using the instrument, an observer enters the classroom, observes for a few minutes to get the feel of what is going on, and then begins to write once every three seconds the number of the category which describes the situation at the moment. If what is going on changes within the three-second period, the observer records the change as well. This means that by the end of seventeen or eighteen minutes, the observer will have recorded something like 400 tallies, in sequence, in columns.

One of the major breakthroughs of the system then consists of the way in which these numbers are tabulated into a checkerboard, or matrix, for interpretation. The numbers are plotted in the matrix two at a time, with the first number of a pair being the row entry, and the second number of the pair the column entry. The tally is then recorded in the cell which represents the junction of row and column. The effect, then, is that any given cell in the matrix represents simultaneously what is going on now (the column heading) and what immediately preceded this activity (the row heading). As a consequence, it is possible to examine sequence in the classroom, one step at a time. For example, it is easy to answer such questions as what does a teacher do immediately after a pupil stops talking—does he frequently praise or encourage students, does he use the ideas suggested by students in further development of discussion, or does he ignore the pupil and proceed with an idea of his own. Or, indeed, does he typically criticize, give directions, or justify his authority? It seems likely that the teacher behavior which has the most profound effect on pupils will be the teacher behavior which immediately follows a pupil contribution, so that this kind of sequence seems critically important.

Alternatively, one can answer such questions as, does most of the pupil talk occur in response to the teacher, or does a major portion of it originate in pupil ideas? Does most of the pupil talk in the classroom tend to follow indirect teacher activities or does it occur primarily following direct teacher activities? The implications of differences such as these seem compelling.

The drill session is readily identified as a rapid alternation of a teacher question and a student answer; discipline problems in the classroom are likely to be visible as a sequence of teacher criticism and direction with an intervening pupil activity followed by more criticism and directions.

In studying teachers and their pupils both in the Midwest and in New Zealand, Flanders found similar relationships between teacher behavior and pupil growth. Although New Zealand teachers used somewhat more direct influence than did Midwestern teachers, in both cases more favorable pupil attitudes were associated with more indirect teaching—praising pupils, clarifying and using pupils' ideas, and asking questions. A replication study in the Midwest with more intensive analysis found, again, that when pupil differences in ability were controlled by analysis of covariance, pupils in indirect classrooms learned significantly more, both in mathematics and in social studies. Differences in the expected direction were also found for favorableness of attitudes.

The major differences between the indirect and the direct teachers were described by Flanders as those in which the indirect teachers were more attentive to what the pupils said and made better use of student ideas, whereas the direct teachers gave more directions and their students resisted them more. A surprising result was that the indirect social studies teachers appeared to lecture more than the direct teachers but this trend did not hold for the mathematics teachers.

A later study in this series was one done by Amidon and Flanders (1961) in which pupils who were classified with respect to dependence-proneness were exposed to role-played direct or indirect teacher behavior in a unit in geometry. In this study, dependent-prone pupils were found to achieve more in the classes in which the indirect teacher was role-played, whereas there was no difference for less dependent-prone pupils. One might have hypothesized that dependent-prone pupils would have functioned better in classrooms in which more teacher structure was supplied (direct teaching) but this was not the case. Rather, apparently indirect teaching is more conducive to pupil growth; but more dependent-prone pupils are more influenced by differences in teacher style than are less dependent-prone pupils.

In other studies using the same system for observation, LaShier (1966) has reported highly significant relationships between indirectness of teacher style and pupil achievement gain in a Biological Sciences Curriculum Study laboratory block, and with more favorable attitudes also significantly related to teacher indirectness.

Furst (1967) applied the Flanders system of Interaction

Analysis to the tapes recorded in Bellack's study. When she pooled two measures of teacher indirectness with extended student talk, this composite measure was significantly related to pupil growth in achievement in the four-day unit Bellack used to obtain a measure of achievement.

Among the studies utilizing other observational systems, Perkins (1965) compared the relations of a number of dimensions of teacher-pupil behavior in the classroom to achievement gain or loss for underachievers separately from achievers. A "quiet study" factor was associated with increases in achievement for all pupils. Both "teacher leading recitation" and "student individual work" were related to gains by achievers more often than by underachievers. The "teacher lecturer-criticizer" was related to withdrawal on the part of both underachievers and achievers, to underachievers not watching or listening, and to loss by both groups in several achievement areas. However, both groups gained in reading vocabulary in association with this factor.

A Study of Teacher-Pupil Behavior Patterns and Pupil Growth

Although it was carried out with upper elementary pupils, rather than with secondary pupils, one of the more extensive analyses of relations between teacher-pupil behavior and pupil growth is a study of my wife's and mine (Soar, 1966). In this study, pupil growth in achievement, creativity, and personality was assessed by testing pupils at the beginning and the end of the first year of the project, and again at the end of the second year of the project. Pupil attitudes toward the classroom, and perceptions of it, were collected at the end of each year.

During each of the two years of the project, teacher-pupil behavior was observed using two systems, Flanders' Interaction Analysis, and another instrument which was constructed primarily to obtain information which Interaction Analysis did not record. Items were taken from several revisions of the Observation Schedule and Record, and Fowler's (1962) Hostility Affection Schedule. From the former instrument, items were taken which reflected freedom of movement of pupils and teachers in the classroom, the extent to which pupils took central roles in the activities of the classroom, and the size and purpose of groupings in the classroom, along with the presence or absence of the teacher. The Hostility Affection Schedule records behaviors which reflect feelings on the part of both teacher and pupils, both verbal and nonverbal, both supportive and nonsupportive. For example, if a teacher raps on his desk, or glares at a student, or points at him, any of these activities would be tallied as teacher nonverbal, hostile. (The use of the term "hostile" follows the practices of psychologists more than those of educators—we would probably be more likely to think of these as simply nonsupportive.) If, on the other hand, the teacher pats the child's shoulder, or ruffles his hair, or gives him a hug, or listens intently to what he is saying, any one of these would be categorized as teacher nonverbal, supportive. Behaviors making up the rest of the eight combinations of teacher-pupil, verbal-nonverbal, and supportive-nonsupportive can probably be inferred from these examples accurately enough for our purposes here.

About 60 measures of teacher-pupil behavior in the classroom were derived from these observation schedules, and reduced through two successive factor analyses—a procedure which identifies scales or dimensions with which clusters of behavior may be identified. Ultimately, some nine dimensions of teacher-pupil behavior were identified, six of which were clearly related to different aspects of pupil growth in the classroom.

Climate and Control in Relation to Pupil Growth. An initial series of analyses was carried out using the data of the first factor analysis as a means of identifying different classroom climates. Factors were sought in this analysis which appeared to be analogs of the factors which have been identified in small group research as related to group effectiveness—those representing the directness or tightness of leader control on the one hand, and of emotional climate on the other.

A clear direct-indirect factor was obtained, but there was not a single, clear emotional climate factor. Rather, there were several. The clearest was one which represented the expression of criticism or hostility by both teacher and pupils, both verbal and nonverbal. For each grade level, three through six, classrooms were sought which represented the four combinations of extreme conditions: direct control—high hostility; direct control—low hostility; indirect control—high hostility; and indirect control—low hostility. Grade levels and the two dimensions of classroom behavior made three factors in an analysis of variance, so that it was a 2x2x4 analysis. Measures of pupil change in vocabulary, reading, and creativity were then studied for these classrooms.

For the creativity measures, the independent variable of principal effect appeared to be grade level, in which the fourth grade seemed generally to produce results different from either the third or the fifth and sixth grades. The classroom behavior measures appeared to operate chiefly in interaction with grade level, either increasing or decreasing its effect. These results relate to Torrance's (1962) finding of a "fourth-grade slump." No actual decrease in creativity was found at any point in our data, but significant differences in the rate of growth were found. This was not entirely unexpected, since Torrance's description of the classrooms in which his data were collected sounded as though the transition from third to fourth grade was much more abrupt in many ways in his schools than in the ones we were studying. We also had the feeling, as did visitors to the system, that the schools in which we were working were unusually supportive ones.

Later in the analysis of the data, we were prompted to compare the Interaction Analysis data from our study to those data from the Flanders study and Furst's analysis of Bellack's data. We found that for numbers of measures our 55 teachers were more indirect on the average than the subgroups of indirect teachers in the Flanders study. The least criticism expressed by any subgroup of Flanders teachers was three times the average for our teachers, and Bellack's teachers averaged 30 times as much criticism. The unusual nature of these classrooms will need recognition in interpreting our results at a number of points.

The results for reading and vocabulary growth (from the *Iowa Tests of Basic Skills*) were more significantly related to the classroom behavior variables, although vocabulary also showed the effects of grade level, with the fourth grade showing less growth than any of the other three grades. This is somewhat surprising, since the scores employed were grade level months, and it would seem reasonable that differences from grade to grade would have been normed out in the standardization of the test.

The results for vocabulary conformed nicely with our expectations. Indirect teacher control produced significantly more growth than direct teacher control, and low-hostile classrooms produced significantly more growth than high-hostile classrooms did. The best combination of conditions produced approximately two and a half more months of growth than did the poorest combination. Since the time span between testings was not much greater than seven months, this would seem to be a proportional increase of considerable importance.

It was also interesting to notice that having one of the optimum conditions (either indirect teacher control or a non-hostile classroom) produced most of the growth increase which was found for both optimum conditions together. That is, so far as this analysis was concerned, the two influences on pupil learning appeared to be interchangeable, one approximately as effective as the other, and the two together not very much better than either one alone.

Considerably different results were found for reading, however. As before, indirect teaching produced somewhat more pupil growth than did direct teaching, but the effects of grade-level and emotional climate were not separately significant. The most significant, and the greatest differences, however, were found for the simultaneous effects of teacher control and emotional climate—but with these influences working together in an unexpected way. The greatest pupil growth occurred in classrooms in which there was indirect teaching but high expression of hostility. The *least* growth occurred either where there was direct teaching and high hostility or where there was indirect teaching with low hostility. An intermediate effect was found for classrooms in which the teaching was direct but there was low hostility expression. If one assumes that indirect teaching is an optimum style and that low hostility expression is an optimum condition, then the greatest pupil growth occurred in classrooms in which there was a combination of one optimum and one non-optimum condition, and the least pupil growth occurred in classrooms in which either both optimum conditions were present or neither was present.

The interpretation of these results presents two related problems: why the results should differ from vocabulary to reading; and why presumed non-optimum conditions should produce most pupil growth. One way of dealing with these difficulties is to relate them to some of the laboratory studies of simple versus complex learning in relation to anxiety. The findings from these studies indicate that simple tasks are learned more rapidly under levels of anxiety that are high enough to inhibit more complex learning (and, as would be expected, that still higher levels of anxiety inhibit both kinds of learning). If, then, it were assumed that reading is a less abstract function than vocabulary, *as it is measured here*, then it would be reasonable to generalize from the laboratory studies to assume that the more complex function should proceed best under conditions of less anxiety (perhaps also interpretable as tension, environmental pressure, or stress).

The interpretation would then be that vocabulary was best learned under least tension, but that reading was best learned under somewhat higher tension—either combination of stressful and non-stressful conditions. Both sources of stress were too much, and neither was too little.

Although I suspect that most of us think of reading as the most complex activity with which the elementary school child is engaged, examination of the materials of these two subtests suggests that vocabulary, as it is presented there, may indeed be a more complex function than reading. There are, for example, few nouns in the vocabulary list; adjectives and adverbs, words expressing relationships, are much more frequent. On the other hand, the reading subtest consistently presents a paragraph or two of material, and then asks relatively concrete, factual questions about the material.

A related fact which also appears to bear on the relative complexity of these two functions was that vocabulary was not systematically taught in these classrooms, whereas reading certainly was. If a child did not know the meaning of a word, the teacher would help him with it, but lessons in vocabulary, as such, occurred infrequently if at all. As a consequence, pupils presumably did much of their vocabulary learning by inference from context, which would seem to be a relatively abstract way of learning.

The unusually supportive nature of these schools is probably related to this finding as well. That is, in less supportive schools, it would be reasonable to assume that tension levels in the classroom would already be high enough on the average, that the effects of either hostility expression or direct teaching would be to raise the tension levels still further, and to make them high enough as to be non-optimum even for the somewhat less abstract kind of learning.

Results for creativity paralleled these, in some respects For all three of the creativity measures, grade level was the only influence which was significant by itself. It was opposite, however, in the direction of its effect from one measure to another. For the nonverbal creativity measure, pupil growth was *greatest* at the fourth-grade level, whereas for product improvement, pupil growth was least at the fourth-grade level, and for the unusual uses measured results were somewhat intermediate. This finding gained support from the work of Wodtke and Wallen (1965), who found greater nonverbal creative growth under "high control" teachers, in contrast to verbal creativity which grew more under "low control" teachers.

Intuitively, it seems reasonable to see the sort of drawing tasks involved in the nonverbal creative measures as less abstract than tasks which require written verbal reports, particularly for pupils at these grade levels, and it also seems reasonable to assume that the production of "silly" pictures would not invoke the peer group pressures on a pupil that the "silly" verbal response would. So at least one interpretation, again, of the differences in the creativity findings is that the transitions of the fourth grade involve increase of stress for pupils, and that the creativity tasks differ in the amount of stress which is optimum for growth, and perhaps, as well, in the amount of stress which is induced by the peer culture. It is relevant, again, to suggest that these were probably schools in which the degree of stress induced in pupils was minimal.

Summer Growth. A set of data which was not planned as part of the original study but which became available as a consequence of the school's testing program, has turned out in retrospect to be one of the more interesting. We had originally planned to test the fall and spring of the first year and the spring of the second year. We had assumed that this would encompass two years of growth on the part of pupils, and that the effect of the summer in between would be negligible. However, the school system of which three of our schools were part used the same achievement tests at the beginning of the sixth grade that we had used in the project. As a consequence, for entering sixth-grade pupils, we had available still another set of scores. This made it possible to examine three periods of pupil growth separately—the first academic year, the summer, and the second academic year.

One of the ways in which these data were examined was to analyze summer growth for pupils in relation to the same two variables of teacher control and emotional climate which were used in the preceding analyses. Since these analyses were all carried out for pupils for the summer between the fifth and sixth grades, grade level dropped out as a factor in the analysis. The results for vocabulary were again the simplest and most clear-cut. Here, pupils who had indirect teaching the previous year grew approximately five and a half months in vocabulary during the summer, whereas pupils who had had direct teaching the previous year grew a little more than three months. For reading, none of the results were significant, but the pattern of interaction of the two classroom influences on pupil growth was exactly the same as it had been for the school year; that is, the combination of a presumed optimum and non-optimum condition produced most growth.

The analysis of growth in arithmetic concepts showed only the interaction to be significant, and the differences between means suggest that the low hostility-indirect combination of conditions produced more growth than the other three combinations as a group. This suggests a partial parallel with the vocabulary results. For arithmetic problems the interaction was again significant but the interpretation of the pattern was not clear. Presumably, again, arithmetic concepts were a more abstract measure than problems.

The evidence, then, seemed to indicate that the preceding year's classroom did make a difference in the amount of pupil growth which took place the following summer; further, the kind of classroom which produced most growth during the year also tended to produce more growth the summer following.

Another interesting aspect of the data was the relative amount of growth which took place over the summer. Pupils appeared to grow, on the average, approximately as rapidly during the summer, per unit of time, as they did during the school year. This conclusion is subject to some qualification in the sense that our fall testing was not begun until after classrooms had "settled down" and our spring testing was completed before the end of school and that the process of testing all of the classrooms required about a month to complete. As a consequence, the school year, as our testing represented it, was more like seven months than nine, and the summer more like five months than three. In addition, the initial activity of the fall was usually a review session, so that the previous year's work was presumably fresher in the minds of the pupils than it otherwise might have been.

Despite all these questions, it still seemed quite possible that an amount of growth took place during the summer months which was large enough to be of practical importance. This was at first surprising, but there is some support for it in the literature. Schrepel and Laslett (1936) found growth over the summer in 14 out of 22 subtests. They commented as well that brighter pupils tended to show greater amounts of gain, and both they and Word and Davis (1938) commented on the greater likelihood of growth over the summer in material involving concepts, understanding, or application of principles, in contrast to factual learning which was more likely to show a decline.

Classrooms in our schools were generally above grade level in achievement, and our measures were chosen so as to represent concepts more than factual material. In addition, a recent study in the Baltimore County Schools (Gabriel, 1966) showed losses in most of the classrooms studied, but found growth had occurred for the pupils from a small number of classrooms. They comment: "In certain schools the teacher influences the student's retention of knowledge and skills over the summer. The reasons for this are not clear and few conclusions can be drawn from this part of the study" (page 23).

The variability associated with the summer growth suggested that there might be pupils who grew as much or more during the summer than for either school year. Inspection of the data showed examples of what appeared to be individual differences in the periods within which the pupil tended to show most of his growth. It was easy to find examples of pupils who grew at the expected rate during both school years, but little or not at all during the intervening summer. But examples of the reverse pattern were also easy to find—pupils who grew rapidly during the summer, but little or not at all during the school year. A count was made of individual children whose summer gain was as much or more than their previous year's gain, with the finding that this was true for 33 percent of the group for vocabulary and 43 percent of the group for reading. A portion of each of these percentages presumably reflects unreliability of measurement (as well as the factors cited above) yet the possibility of consistent patterns or "styles of learning" still seemed a real one, and extremely provocative. As a way of testing whether such patterns existed, the gain scores for the three periods were intercorrelated.

The prediction was made that if pupils really differed in their preferred mode of learning there would be positive correlations between vocabulary and reading within each time period and between the first year and the second year, but that both years should correlate negatively with summer growth.

It was recognized that the values of the correlations would be likely to be quite low, since the gain scores under analysis lack the large, stable element which looms large in the comparison of status scores. If, as Thorndike (1966) suggests, the correlation of initial status with gain is probably on the order of +.10 then it would not be reasonable to expect two measures of gain to correlate very highly, especially when gains in different subject matters were involved. Accordingly, the predictions were made only for the signs of the correlation coefficients. The analysis of the three periods of gain for the verbal tests produced 15 correlation coefficients, every one of which was in the predicted direction. This is a result which could occur by chance less than one time in a thousand, as indicated by the sign test. A similar analysis for the arithmetic measures produced 11 of 15 signs in the predicted direction which reached approximately the 6 percent level. When the two sets of results are pooled, 26 of 30 signs were in the predicted direction which is significant beyond the one-tenth of one percent level. It is perhaps worthy of note that more negative than positive correlations were predicted.

These results suggest that perhaps we can posit two groups of learners (probably the extremes of a continuum)—the conventional learner who does most of his learning in the classroom under the teacher's direction, and another (the summer learner?) who does most of his learning during the summer, on his own.

There is evidence of what may be a similar continuum of differences in learning styles identified by Torrance (1965). He cites results from several studies which he interprets as pointing to two pupil styles of learning—learning by authority and learning by discovery. When one style or the other was favored by instructional procedures or examinations, different sets of pupils did well, and correlations with measures of intelligence were significantly different.

While it is not clear that the continuum of differences identified by Torrance is the same one apparently effective here, the two sets of results do appear to support each other in agreeing that different styles of learning exist.

The possibility that important amounts of growth for some pupils may occur outside the school year raises some provocative questions. Lacking information about summer growth, as the school usually does, is it not likely that a pupil following such a pattern would be labeled an "underachiever"?

Perhaps some children are more self-directed learners than are others and so continue learning on their own during the summer.

Perhaps some children find the classroom a source of stimulation which later results in growth, but requires a period of time for something like integration, synthesis, or consolidation.

Perhaps the concept of good teaching needs more emphasis placed on the potential of the classroom for initiating learning which continues later. This has been a part of theory, but it has received little attention in empirical studies.

Is it possible that pupils learn when we are not looking? Perhaps we all assume this, but do not take it seriously, or do not take advantage of it.

Classroom Behavior Factors in Relation to Pupil Growth. The results cited so far were all obtained from the use of two factors taken from the first factor analysis. As was mentioned in the procedure section, a second factor analysis was carried out in the hope of clarifying the picture of classroom interaction after redundancy of the various measures had been reduced. A nine-factor rotation was taken as the clearest picture these data afforded of interaction in these classrooms, and the factor scores for each classroom along with measures of pupil mean change for those same classrooms were intercorrelated. Of the nine factors, six were significantly related to one or more aspects of pupil change.

Two factors represented the expression of negative effect in the classroom, one primarily by the teacher, the other primarily by pupils. Both correlated significantly negatively with pupil achievement growth. Teacher criticism was also associated with decreases in pupil anxiety and increases in pupil dependency. Perhaps these two together indicate pupil reduction in anxiety bought at a cost of increasing dependency, under the teacher who exercises tighter control over the classroom. The pupil hostility factor also related negatively to growth in creativity. When the unusually supportive nature of these classrooms is remembered, it seems likely that these data may underestimate the strength of the relationship.

The factor which related most strongly to pupil achievement growth was one which apparently represented the pacing of teacher-pupil interchanges. The pattern which apparently produced most pupil growth was one in which the teacher presented information or opinion to pupils, or perhaps structured a problem, to the extent of 15 or 20 seconds; then asked a question; and then the pupils talked at some length. In this group of classrooms, the average length of this kind of teacher talk for all observations was approximately seven seconds—against this reference point longer periods of teacher talk and of pupil talk were associated with greater pupil learning. The other end of the factor was identified by drill-type activities, and this sort of interchange was associated with decreased pupil learning. The factor was also negatively related to pupil liking for the teacher, suggesting that pupils may not prefer sharing responsibility for the learning process.

Other aspects of the data suggested that teacher lecture, in the usual sense, was not associated with pupil learning. A factor which appeared to represent varying proportions of teacher versus pupil talk failed to relate to any aspect of pupil change. It may be that Flanders' finding that his indirect social studies teachers lectured more than the direct teachers is relevant, here.

Two factors appeared to represent pupil freedom of different sorts: one, pupil freedom in discussion; the other, pupil freedom of physical movement. The freedom of discussion factor related to nothing, the physical freedom factor related significantly negatively to pupil growth in creativity and to the pupil's perception of classroom climate. Probably this latter finding is to be interpreted against the background that these were classrooms, on the average, which offered a great deal of freedom, so that classrooms which were above average were characterized by more disorder than is useful for pupil growth, and this was perceived by pupils. Writers on creativity often mention discipline as a concept relevant to creative productivity—perhaps this is the appropriate concept here.

The most surprising finding from this set of results was that a factor which represented indirectness of teacher control versus an apparent lack of control failed to relate to pupil subject-matter growth. The relation between indirectness and pupil achievement growth has been found in enough studies to support its validity strongly.

Probably the extremely indirect nature of these classrooms is again relevant. It seems reasonable to assume that what we have here is a set of relationships in which increasing indirectness of teacher control facilitates pupil learning up to a point but that beyond that point increasing degrees of indirectness are no longer facilitative and may at more extreme levels even be destructive of pupil learning. The data other investigators have reported fall at lower levels of this variable, and a strong linear relationship is found. These data, however, describing higher levels of this behavior variable are dealing with the nonlinear section of the overall relationship, where a linear measure of relationship is not significant.

In the analyses of variance reported earlier, the classrooms which were studied were selected on three bases—indirectness of control, expression of hostility, and grade level—so that the most extreme classrooms were not generally represented. In addition, a single measure of indirectness was used in that analysis, whereas in this correlation analysis the measure of indirectness was a factor score which pooled four separate measures of indirect teacher behavior. Perhaps the classroom which is indirect on four measures is more completely indirect than one which is indirect on one measure. These differences presumably account for the finding of significant relationships which were observed in the earlier analysis.

Another finding in relation to this latter indirectness factor, however, was that it was significantly correlated positively with pupil growth in creativity. Apparently creativity growth is facilitated by levels of indirectness more extreme than those which foster subject-matter growth. This finding, in relation to the differences in findings between vocabulary and reading growth cited earlier suggest that these three measures may represent three points on a scale of abstractness, or complexity, or divergence for which differing degrees of direction and control are optimum—with reading requiring the most, vocabulary less, and creativity growth least of all.[1]

Another finding which relates to these just described is that when pupils were divided at the median on the pretest anxiety measure and the intercorrelations recalculated separately for the two subgroups, the relation between the indirectness factor and pupil growth in creativity was still higher for the low anxious pupils, and lower for the high anxious group. Apparently, then, high anxious pupils were not able to use the freedom of the highly indirect classroom as constructively as were low anxious pupils.

When these findings are considered together, what emerges is a set of relationships in which different kinds of pupil growth differ in the degree of indirectness which is optimum, and in which pupils who differ in personality differ in the levels of indirectness which are optimum. Both of these relationships would be expected on a theoretical basis, but there have been relatively little classroom data in support of them.

Systematic Observation as a Training Tool

As indicated earlier, the descriptive studies of classroom behavior suggest that the typical classroom is one in which the cognitive level of the interaction is low, and the degree of teacher control is high. The question was then raised as to what role the typical teacher might play if or when automated instruction became available in the classroom, assuming that the lower cognitive levels would be the easiest for hardware to assume (just as they apparently are for teachers).

---

[1] This interpretation of the results of several analyses has since been tested by further analysis of the data, and supported. See: R. S. Soar, "Optimum Teacher-Pupil Interaction for Pupil Growth." *Research Supplement, Educational Leadership* 26(3): 275-80; December 1968.

Some of the recent studies in which observation systems have been used as training devices suggest hope for increasing teacher skill in assuming a different role—that of providing the indirect classroom leadership and supportive emotional climate which support pupil growth, and of stimulating classroom discourse which rises above the lowest levels of thinking. For example, teachers trained in Flanders' Interaction Analysis or one of its modifications teach differently than do teachers who have not had this training. They lecture less, criticize less, and their pupils talk more. More of the teacher interaction is emotionally supportive, and acceptant of pupil ideas. In Flanders' terms, they teach more indirectly (Amidon, 1966; Hough and Ober, 1966). There is also evidence that they are better able to alter their teaching behavior from situation to situation (Amidon, 1966; Hough and Ober, 1966; Simon, 1966), whereas the evidence suggests that other teachers tend to teach their classes as though they were interchangeable (Pfeiffer, 1966; Simon, 1966), and teach the beginning, middle, and end of a unit of study in similar fashion (Furst, 1967). Similarly, the teacher given a system for looking at the cognitive level of discourse in his classroom tends to raise this level (Sanders, 1966).

Apparently what happens is that the teacher trained in such a system is given a means both for conceptualizing and for measuring what he is doing in his classroom, and these together provide him with a feedback loop. Then he can examine his teaching behavior to see whether it conforms to his conception of what good teaching is like. If it does not, he has rather specific information about how to change, and a way, in turn, for testing whether his attempt to change has been successful.

Implications for the Classroom

It seems clear, when we look at the research of the past few years, that there has been a sharp change in the fruitfulness of the output. No longer can the results of research be summarized by the single hypothesis that "nothing makes any difference."

It seems clear, in general, that a more indirect, more open, more supportive style of teacher behavior does increase pupil growth. In addition, the increased growth goes beyond subject matter, and includes more favorable attitudes and increased creativity.

Furthermore, the data seem to suggest that the greater the value attached to higher level objectives such as abstract, conceptual knowledge, or the development of creativity and of positive attitudes, the more important an open, supportive, indirect style of teaching becomes.

Yet these general principles require qualification. It is clear that the optimum level of indirectness is not the maximum, but short of that. It is clear that the optimum level of teacher criticism is not the least, but an amount greater than that. Further, there are suggestions that both learning tasks and pupils differ in the levels of these behaviors which are optimum. In most settings, these optimum values will probably be far beyond the range of the classroom behavior which occurs, so that the general principle will apply. But in the "best" schools, the qualifications may become important. Probably what these findings mean is that there is a minimum of structure required in the classroom for effective learning to take place, and that it is possible for the most open, free, indirect classrooms not to provide the minimum of structure which is needed.

The importance of a facilitative classroom climate is underlined by the finding that its effect continues after the pupil leaves the classroom. At the maximum, such a climate produced nearly a twofold difference in the pupil growth that occurred during the summer; but this result is in all probability an underestimate, since the sample of schools studied was unusually supportive as a group.

There seems little question that we can now measure the interaction of teacher and pupils sufficiently well to begin to identify not only the dimensions of behavior which support pupil growth, but the optimum levels of these dimensions. And when we compare the results of research in this area with what psychologists and educators have felt must be true on the basis of their experience with children, the congruence is encouraging in the extreme.

Yet the greatest hope, and one whose realization is beginning to occur already, is that of extending and refining this knowledge, and of helping teachers translate it into reality in the classroom. Here there is real hope for humanizing the classroom—for making it a place where personal and social growth are warmly supported, where the excitement of intellectual stimulation is a way of life, and where freedom leads to responsible self-direction. These are goals which may no longer be idealistic dreams, but attainable realities.

Bibliography

E. Amidon. "Using Interaction Analysis at Temple University." Paper read at Conference of the Association for Student Teaching. Rochester, New York: University of Rochester, 1966.

E. Amidon and N. A. Flanders. "The Effects of Direct and Indirect Teacher Influence on Dependent-Prone Students Learning Geometry." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 52: 286-91; 1961.

A. Bellack and J. Davitz. *The Language of the Classroom: Meanings Communicated in High School Teaching.* Cooperative Research Project No. 1497, U.S. Office of Education. New York: Institute of Psychological Research, Columbia University, 1963.

A. Bellack *et al. The Language of the Classroom: Meanings Communicated in High School Teaching, Part Two.* Cooperative Research Project No. 1497, U.S. Office of Education. New York: Institute of Psychological Research, Columbia University, 1965.

W. B. Brookover. "Relation of Social Factors to Teaching Ability." *Journal of Experimental Education* 13: 191-205; 1945.

N. A. Flanders. *Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement.* Cooperative Research Monograph No. 12, OE-25040. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1965.

B. D. Fowler. "Relations of Teacher Personality Characteristics and Attitudes to Teacher-Pupil Rapport and Emotional Climate in the Elementary Classroom." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1962.

N. F. Furst. "The Multiple Languages of the Classroom: A Further Analysis and a Synthesis of Meanings Communicated in High School Teaching." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1967.

G. T. Gabriel. "The Application of the Computer for Research Activities in Baltimore County Public School System." Paper read at American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February 1966.

J. J. Gallagher and Mary Jane Aschner. "A Preliminary Report: Analyses of Classroom Interaction." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 9: 183-94; 1963.

J. B. Hough and R. Ober. "The Effect of Training in Interaction Analysis on the Verbal Teaching Behavior of Preservice Teachers." Paper presented at American Education Research Association meeting, Chicago, Illinois, 1966.

M. Hughes *et al. Development of the Means for the Assessment of the Quality of Teaching in Elementary Schools.* Cooperative Research Project No. 353, U.S. Office of Education. Provo: University of Utah, 1959.

W. W. LaShier. "The Use of Interaction Analysis in BSCS Laboratory Block Classrooms." Paper presented at the National Science Teachers Association, New York, April 1966.

D. M. Medley and H. E. Mitzel. "A Technique for Measuring Classroom Behavior." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 49: 86-92; 1958.

D. M. Medley and H. E. Mitzel. "Some Behavioral Correlates of Teacher Effectiveness." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 50: 239-46; 1959.

H. V. Perkins. "Classroom Behavior and Underachievement." *American Educational Research Journal* 2: 1-12; 1965.

I. L. Pfeiffer. "Comparison of Verbal Interaction and Goals of Teachers Teaching Classes of Different Ability in Eleventh Grade English." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University, 1966.

N. Sanders. *Classroom Questions: What Kinds.* New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1966.

M. Schrepel and H. R. Laslett. "On the Loss of Knowledge by Junior High School Pupils Over the Summer Vacation." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 27: 299-303; 1936.

A. Simon. "The Effects of Training in Interaction Analysis on the Teaching Patterns of Student Teachers in Favored and Non-Favored Classes." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1966.

R. S. Soar. "An Integrative Approach to Classroom Learning." National Institute of Mental Health Project, Numbers 5-R11 MH 01096 to the University of South Carolina, Columbia, and Numbers 7-R11 MH 02045 to Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1966.

R. L. Thorndike. "Intellectual Status and Intellectual Growth." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 57: 121-27; 1966.

E. P. Torrance. "Cultural Discontinuities and the Development of Originality of Thinking." *Exceptional Children* 28: 2-13; 1962.

E. P. Torrance. "Different Ways of Learning for Different Kinds of Children." In: *Mental Health and Achievement: Increasing Potential and Reducing School Dropout.* E. P. Torrance and R. D. Strom, editors. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965. pp. 253-62.

K. H. Wodtke and N. E. Wallen. "The Effects of Teacher Control in the Classroom on Pupils' Creativity-Test Gains." *American Educational Research Journal* 2: 75-82; 1965.

A. H. Word and R. A. Davis. "Individual Differences in Retention of General Science Subject Matter in the Case of Three Measurable Teaching Objectives." *Journal of Experimental Education* 7: 24-30; 1938.

A Technology and Performance Curriculum

Dwight W. Allen

Dwight W. Allen discusses alternative strategies for educators in their attitudes toward using a wide range of technologies in education. They can:

1. Refuse to accept the technologies under a presumption that they are an unorthodox encroachment on the humaneness of American education;

2. Remain indifferent and disengaged until the technologies are perfected; or

3. Seek to shape the development of technologies to anticipate educational needs.

A strong argument is made for the latter of the three alternatives.

The paper goes on to discuss specific uses of technology in:

1. Scheduling to provide teachers and students with a greater range of alternatives for educational decision making

2. Individualizing instruction by providing appropriate instructional content, opportunities for learning experiences, materials, resources laboratories, and teacher-pupil interaction

3. Rethinking and redefining the role of teachers by recognizing

different levels of performance and differentiating the responsibilities of teaching

4. Establishing performance criteria as a basis for developing more precisely identified measurement tools for student achievement of the broad instructional objectives of the school.

The paper is concluded with the proposition that "unless secondary schools meet the challenge posed by curricula based on performance and not just innovation, the danger is that such schools will cease to serve adequately the society whose future citizens it is their responsibility to educate." —N.K.H.

AMERICAN culture is organized around active mastery rather than passive acceptance. Its peculiar genius in the external world is manipulative rather than contemplative. And although our contemporary society marvels at and prizes creativity and those who have its gift, we reserve our greatest admiration for the glories of mass production.

The resolution of this conflict between the more humane and liberalizing pursuits of man, which free him from ignorance, fear, prejudice, and pettiness, and the so-called dehumanizing aspects of automation, which impersonally organize more of his waking hours, is now education's crucial concern. Educators have to deal with both quality and increasing quantity; not merely with man's production, but with the production of men who are free to create new images of freedom. The present condition in education argues against such freedom.

Students are now bound to the arbitrary masters of time, control, and supervision. We have channeled students into archaic mazes that contract rather than expand their individual freedom and consequently their initiative and potential for creativity.

The beauty of the technologies now available in education is that they can do for educators what, because of insufficient time and money, the educators cannot do for themselves. Technologies can do for students what the students cannot do for themselves by giving them the freedom to choose and new alternatives to choose from.

Among the democratic ancients only the free men and citizens were permitted to pursue the higher arts. Now, at least theoretically, all have the choice to pursue such liberal arts. Yet the paradox is that the process of education has been enslaved to the system by which it is transmitted, a structure outmoded by at least five decades.

Various technologies can free students from the arbitrariness, routineness, similarity, and monotony of unbroken hour-long instruction.

Three Strategies Toward Use of Technologies

We can assume three strategies or attitudes toward the use of a wide range of technologies in education:

1. We can refuse to accept the technologies under the presumption that they are an unorthodox encroachment on the humaneness of American education;
2. We can remain indifferent and disengaged until the technologies are perfected; or
3. We can seek to shape the development of technology to anticipate educational needs.

Historically, a patient, conservative, and hesitant attitude toward technology has characterized educational policy.

The danger of refusing to accept technology means that we must wait until a given technology has thoroughly proven itself in every other discipline and enterprise before applying it to education. If, on the other hand, we anticipate the potential of technology in our schools, the advantages are not only earlier use but, more important, that educators have the initiative in developing the *direction* of technology. The advantage of shaping the technology, of determining the methods by which it can best be used, of deciding how it will best be used, will ensure that education will not be subject to the decisions made by others, but that it can take the initiative in shaping, not in being subject to, or shaped by technology.

To limit the uses of technology to the mechanics of education—scheduling, report cards, or personnel records—is to neglect the more imaginative development of the technology in relation to the learning process. *Educators must take the lead in developing the technology to humanize mass education.* We must find means to individualize instruction more effectively, to continually reexamine and revise the curriculum, to synthesize common and overlapping disciplines.

The computer is an example of a complex technological tool used in education. What are some of its uses? One of the most advanced applications to education is a system that develops computer-generated master schedules. The Stanford School Scheduling System, developed by Robert Oakford, has been recently planned in the public domain. Educational Coordinates in Palo Alto, California, the largest user itself, scheduled more than 100 schools, double the number of schools scheduled two years previously by the Stanford group totally.

A computer-generated flexible schedule provides teachers and students with a greater range of alternatives for educational decision making. Students freed from significant portions of classroom sessions have greater opportunities to:

1. Meet in individual conferences with teachers (at Marshall High School in Portland, Oregon, a recent survey showed that each teacher spent an average of three hours and twenty-five minutes a week in student conferencing);
2. Go to a resource center to pursue a project independently or under the direction of a teacher;
3. Go to an open laboratory and remain as long as necessary to finish an experiment or reach a conclusion;
4. Confer with others in an open classroom on a joint assignment.

Teachers, structured less, can meet with individuals for longer periods to adjust to individual needs, and have more time to prepare instruction. Students, structured less into classroom patterns, can choose from among the entire school's resources, including a wider range of teachers.

Individualizing Instruction

The majority of secondary schools are not oriented to individualizing instruction, though all would claim to be. Students act and react collectively. The teacher may be the only real learner in the high school because he is often the only real *active agent.* Because of organizational structures, groups of students must conform to patterned procedures so that, at least ostensibly, the majority can benefit. Students, as a result, must be passive in relation to the learning activity of the teacher. Nor are materials in the school established to accommodate the individual, but to accommodate the time blocks that regulate the day's pattern, the staff, and all the students. The system is an administrative convenience.

What kind of opportunities for humane, individual experience does the school provide for a student who lacks an adequate reading background? Most commonly the school structures him into a remedial reading course which he often finds as defeating as any other course because he still must compete for grades when he really lacks the training and encouragement necessary for real advancement. The argument is not with the tremendous current efforts of teachers but with the inflexible structure of the system. A remedial reading student in his remedial reading course still carries around his reading handicap with him to all his other classes. How do we justify our actions as humane? How can we say we are freeing the student from his deficiency? The curriculum is not designed around the individual's needs. We only make the curriculum cumulative by adding on course after course to "enrich" or to compensate for gaps in the already overburdened structure.

Variation in interest and ability is related to both length of time and availability and accessibility of materials and instructional aids. If the length of time a student takes to learn a specific skill is irrelevant to learning it, neither does it make much sense that a student is unable to have access to shops or laboratories for experiment and for independent and individual study. Unless shops and laboratories are open most of the school day, students will not be able to use them to optimum advantage. Although the availability of shops and laboratories does not in itself create a course design based on performance, it is clear that student interest will be stimulated because the student can work at his own speed and during his own time. This is but one example of how organizational variables preempt performance and the individualization of instruction.

It is imperative that the structure of the school not be anti-individual. If the concept of human development is important to our thinking, if it is urgent that people not be lost in process, then each student's integrity, uniqueness, and at least partial self-determination must be recognized in the educational program. Students themselves must be responsible for certain levels of decision in their education.

One method of individualizing the instruction is to let achievement, not time spent in class, be the criterion for educational progress. If educators can recognize and provide for new levels of individualization within the school program, then students can realize the continuous development of responsibility so essential to human growth.

The concept of individual instruction does not mean necessarily that the teacher must deal with students one at a time. It does mean that presentation and choice of materials for the individual student should be appropriate for him at that time. The goal of individualization is an appropriate instructional content for each student. If a basic and common presentation is given to all students, some are immediately ready for the next presentation, some need individual and independent study, some need additional presentations, and some need discussion of the material in a group situation. The problem here is to identify which individuals are ready for which of a series of alternatives and to provide them with that appropriate series. Some might need repetition; some, elaboration; some, a presentation of the same material from a different viewpoint or perspective.

The unfortunate organizational restraints of many current administrative arrangements have prevented us from gaining any real perspective on individualized instruction. Providing more varied instructional groupings—larger and smaller classes, longer and shorter classes, meetings of varied frequency—suggests wider ranges of alternatives which will allow for individualized instruction. Individualization can be stimulated within the formal classroom or it may take place as one phase of laboratory instruction. It can be developed by efficient grouping practices for either short or long terms. Classroom facilities can be utilized on an individual basis with the requisition of unused spaces for individual and independent study or for formal or informal small groups which are also particularly adaptable to this type of instruction. Resource centers may be planned specifically for individual study in a given subject with individual carrels and technical centers for such activities as programmed learning or linguistic practice.

The emphasis on individualization of materials and independent study as a basic format of instruction assumes facilities and organizational alternatives not commonly provided at present. There is a need to develop new concepts to individualize and humanize the high school, and the progress of this development will depend largely on our ability to identify and adapt technologies.

Role of the Teacher

Another issue at stake in humanizing the high school is rethinking and redefining the role of the teacher. The present state of the profession has not changed dramatically in the twentieth century. Since the skills which a teacher uses are largely the same for all teachers of a particular subject and for a given grade-grouping level, the job of preparing a beginning teacher has been an enormous and, considering all aspects of the job of teaching, unrealistic task for teacher education institutions.

A recent study of the present characteristics of teachers in California[1] revealed that the general dissatisfaction with professional limits and conditions is at least as important as, if not more important than, salary as a cause of teachers' moving out of the profession.

The requisite step, toward individualizing teaching and recognizing different levels of performance, is to differentiate dramatically the responsibilities of teaching. There is a wide variety of ways in which to arrange a differentiated staff. One way is now under development at Temple City in greater Los Angeles. Administrators and teachers in the Temple City School District are involved in a study to determine the specific roles of the differentiated teaching staff, the roles of administrators, the objectives and responsibilities of incumbents of each of the varying levels of responsibility. Task forces are already at work on the legal implications, communications, and finances. A salary schedule has been adopted by the board of education which provides for a maximum teacher salary higher than that of the superintendent. One school in the district has already implemented the differentiated staff plan.

The educational system must be reanalyzed to allow new alternatives of staff use—alternatives which technology can enhance; alternatives which lead to a more humane use of staff resources and their interaction with and utilization by students.

Performance Criteria

But whatever other concerns we have, our preoccupation must ultimately be with student performance. Performance is the execution of the functions required of a person, the exhibition of a skill. A criterion is the standard of judging, the measure or test of a thing's quality. Establishing performance criteria for secondary schools is not necessarily just a curriculum problem but a problem of determining objectives and of establishing human appreciations.

---

[1] Robert J. Addington. "Sampling Techniques for Administrative Decision Making in Education." Unpublished thesis. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 19[illegible]5.

Present methods of evaluation leave unanswered questions about a student's learning development. How do secondary schools measure, besides the learning of the *content* of a course, a student's social development? What about his increasing ability to learn? What is the standard of value for measuring this elusive quality? How do secondary schools measure a student's ability to make decisions—one of the most important functions of a civilized man? To define his immediate and future goals? Are not all these special qualities a part of the integrated pattern of educational objectives?

It is likely that secondary schools will in the future continue to place emphasis on what the student knows in any given subject area and will test him accordingly. And tests will largely determine his placement. Hopefully, such tests will seek to gauge performance. Actually, tests now tend to be obstacles along an educational track. If too many pupils fail, we lower the barrier. It is irrelevant to ask whether a test is easy or hard if its purpose is the accomplishment of an educational objective. Yet students now speak of tests as easy or hard, which reveals to what extent our objectives perhaps follow the line of least resistance. Moreover, schools need tests which determine the limits of achievement and which set the floor, not the ceiling, of the understanding of chemistry, of English, or of government.

The irony is that even as we become more expert in the development of factual transmittal—more successful in teaching students more information which they may learn better—our need to do so, in fact, may be decreasing sharply.

One way in which technology may ultimately serve to summarize education is to make factual material so accessible, so external to human memory—through computer data banks, electronic retrieval and analytical systems— as to reduce the premium on human knowledge in all but the highest of conceptual levels, even as mechanical and electronic calculators have eliminated the intellectual premium on mental arithmetic. We must take care lest we solve well the wrong problem.

As I see it, current widely accepted educational objectives may not identify the most relevant student performance. A syllabus, a curriculum guide, a stated bit of philosophy governing, supposedly, the "game of school," are the creatures of administrators and teachers—not of students. Proceeding from premises with which students are often unfamiliar, the teacher attempts to evaluate student performance using low level factual abstractions of unspecified objectives within a course. The result is unsatisfactory from almost any point of view, though admittedly most easily measured, sorting students into piles of relative "success."

Lewis Carroll in *Alice in Wonderland* depicts a scene startlingly simple and yet profound in its simplicity. Alice, in her journeys through Wonderland, came to a fork in the road. She asked the smiling Cheshire cat, perched on a limb in a nearby tree, which way she should go. "That depends," the Cheshire cat replied, "on where you're going." Where we are going in education might not have, in actuality, any pertinence to what we are presently doing.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of formulating clearly stated objectives. An instructional objective should specify under what conditions and to what extent performance will take place. For example, "A student will be able to write a paragraph in English with two or less syntax errors in every 300 words." We must replace something called "three years of French or German" with criteria of some measurable degree of fluency in French or German.

As performance criteria are more precisely identified, present practices of evaluation become less tenable. Transcripts which reflect standards of performance frozen in arbitrary time units are often actively misleading. Subsequent modifications in performance are certainly relevant in judging student competence. One alternative is to consider a transcript record as temporary—reflecting a current learning status—but subject to revision without prejudice. It would be interesting to compare predictions of future success based on updated transcript records as contrasted with traditional fixed records.

The barriers to performance are fractured and conditional verities. What is true for a student in history is not true for him in mathematics. But it might be next year. The truth upon which schools operate is segmented according to time and, therefore, is conditioned and determined by the very fluidity of its foundation. Something more accurate and functional is needed.

In our curriculum development, how do we "grade" a student's ability to cross-transfer his knowledge from subject to subject? Is his knowledge an embodiment that can be transferred from place to place as though it were corporeal; or is it rather like a seed that can be sprouted anew in a different climate and under different conditions?

In vocational education, performance criteria have been delineated better than in other subject areas in the high school. Each instructor attempts to differentiate within his vocational course according to the individual abilities of his students and their performances. The standard progress-chart reports of the vocational shop teachers represent a significant effort to individualize instruction according to performance, which is what future employers demand. Yet, the blocks of time in most secondary schools encourage teachers to set the tasks in a pattern of time uniformity. This allows the average student to finish the allotted task only in the time prescribed. The better student finishes in less time and the slower student perhaps never finishes.

The Center for the Study of Instruction, established by the National Education Association, in its publication, *Schools for the Sixties,* makes several relevant recommendations. One recommendation is particularly significant here:

> The vertical organization of the school should provide for the continuous, unbroken, upward progression of all learners, with due recognition of the wide variability among them in every respect of their development. The school organization should, therefore, provide for differentiated rate and mean of progression toward achievement of educational goals. Nongrading and multigrading are promising alternatives to the traditional graded school and should receive careful consideration.[2]

Performance criteria will change within a historical context. Unless secondary schools meet the challenge posed by curricula based on performance and not just innovation, the danger is that such schools will cease to serve adequately the society whose future citizens it is their responsibility to educate. Automation and the resources of technology will bring with them not so much less production as they will more leisure. As educators and free men, we will be less structured by employment and occupation. We will be able to portion out less time to business and to "busyness" and more to speculation and the patient pursuits of wisdom and their applicability in an industrialized world.

If we can direct the role of technology in education and if we can match the performance of our students with the needs of society, we can spend less time, paradoxically, on power and more on potential; less time on consumption and more on education; less on learning and more on being human.

---

[2] Project on the Instructional Program of the Public Schools. *Schools for the Sixties.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963. p. 78. Used by permission.

Alternative Modes of Organizing Secondary Schools

Lloyd S. Michael

Lloyd S. Michael undertakes an analysis of the essential elements which contribute to the development of strong, independent human beings in the secondary schools. He does this by discussing various methods of managing time, space, and human and material resources as means of achieving these desired goals.

The paper includes specific reference to considerations of:

1. *The role of the administrator as an instructional leader*
2. *School size and its implications for organizing to facilitate improvement in learning*
3. *New staffing patterns to permit teachers to make optimum use of their individual abilities and receive optimum satisfaction*
4. *Scheduling procedures for individualization of the learning process*
5. *Provision of facilities which create an open, adaptable environment for teaching and learning*
6. *The changing role of the teacher which requires that he "enter the decision-making process and also assume a commitment for implementation"*
7. *An environment which permits the student to become more*

active in learning, more deeply involved intellectually, more independent of teachers.

Dr. Michael concludes that the new dimension in our commitment to quality secondary education for all youth is the involvement of students in every phase of the educational endeavor.—N.K.H.

THE primary question in this chapter is: How do we organize secondary schools to educate youth for self-fulfillment, for self-growth? To individualize our purpose, how do we organize and function to allow the individual student to grow, to become actualized, to avoid alienation, to enlarge his self? Raymond Houghton clearly identifies the focus of humanism and the teacher in these statements. He says:

> Everyone is an intellectual when provided with the opportunities for involvement. . . . As students find the teacher relevant and the school relevant, they will fight to become involved. It is to be suggested that children drop out of school, not because they wish to avoid involvement, but because they seek it and the schools deny it to them.[1]

The School Administrator

The uniqueness of school administration, as compared with the executive functions in other organizations, is its primary emphasis on teaching and learning. All administrative decisions in schools have as their highest value the facilitation of learning of boys and girls. All administrators are instructional officers, directly or indirectly. Some administrators, however, are more actively involved with instruction than are others. The underlying rationale for all administrative assignments is learning.

The superintendent is the crucial person on a district basis. The importance of his position is derived in large measure from his authority to allocate resources, people, and time which can serve to maintain the status quo or to effect improvement in the self-realization of students in the school system.

It is the building principal who has the strategic and vital role of leadership in teaching and learning. He has the opportunity to create a climate that nurtures or discourages improvement and change, but, more important, he has the opportunity to affect the commitment and involvement of students for their self-direction and responsible behavior.

---

[1] Raymond W. Houghton. "The Focus of Humanism and the Teacher." In: *Humanizing Education: The Person in the Process.* Robert R. Leeper, editor. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967. pp. 60-61.

A basic question is, how can a principal organize the school day, the school year, the staff, both professional and nonprofessional, the curriculum, instruction, and the facilities to produce optimum learning on the part of boys and girls? It is my assumption that unless the building principal assumes this responsibility and works diligently in its realization, the job will not be done. The emphasis here is on his role as an organizer. Other administrative functions, that is, planning, management, supervision, and evaluation, also have their place in the improvement of the teaching-learning process. Arthur Moehlman [2] many years ago stressed a principle that should underlie effective organization. His concept of a dynamic organization emphasized the structure of organization as a facilitating agency through which the purpose of the school might more effectively be achieved. He affirmed also that there was no final validity either in the mechanics or the form of organization. Structure or organization, therefore, is a means, never an end, in the realization of the objectives and functions of a secondary school.

How does the principal see himself? Does he act as an instructional leader who continues to perform those functions which have depersonalizing and alienating effects because of the overemphasis upon the informational phase of learning? Or does he see his role as one of emphasizing the human side of learning wherein commitment and involvement of students lead to responsibility and self-direction for learning?

For the past several years I have held the chairmanship of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals' Committee on the Administrative Internship in Secondary-School Improvement. During this time the Committee has sponsored several hundred interns in what we hoped were innovative high schools. Because the NASSP and the principals themselves all assert that the highest priority among the principal's professional tasks is the improvement of education, the Committee has given major attention to this most important responsibility.

The principal has many demands upon his time other than the responsibility for the improvement of teaching and learning. These demands include discipline, student activities, plant management, guidance and testing, public relations, and many other duties. The superintendent, teachers, and parents expect him to do these tasks. The Committee recognized that these jobs had to be done, but agreed that the principal need not do them. We concluded that:

---

[2] Arthur B. Moehlman. *School Administration.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.

1. The principal's first job is to separate what he needs to do himself from those duties that can be assigned to others.
2. Every principal, regardless of whether his school is large or small, should spend three-fourths of his time on the instructional program as a facilitator of learning.
3. In a large school, this means that a variety of specially trained assistants who are directly concerned with attendance, discipline, student activities, public relations, clerical services, plant management, cafeteria operation, and transportation should be appointed.

The Internship Program has emphasized that if the principal is to create a climate which leads to instructional improvement, a plan for teacher participation and student involvement is a necessary requisite.

School Size

The internal structure of a secondary school can contribute to humanizing the education of students. There is much debate about the optimum size of a high school because of our concern for the individual student and his welfare, and our awareness of the need for personal identification and close relationship between teacher and pupil. Many parents, teachers, and administrators have a sincere distrust of a large high school. It is felt that many of the unique advantages of the small school are lost in public secondary schools of over 1,000 enrollment unless the schools are organized to protect individual pupil interests and needs. On the other hand, there are definite disadvantages in a small school. Some of these limitations have been stated as:

1. Many important subjects either cannot be offered or must be offered at considerable cost to very few students.
2. The expense of maintaining a staff of good teachers may be extremely high.
3. Important educational services such as special education, instructional centers, specialized vocational and college guidance are not available.
4. Costly special facilities, such as shops, laboratories, and resource centers are not provided.

Some educators will claim excellence for their school on the sole criterion of numbers in the student body, regardless of the extent to which size contributes to the quantity and quality of the educational services available to the individual student and his identification with the school. There is the interesting paradox where, largely through consolidation or single community population growth, small schools are hopeful of attaining better status by becoming large schools, and large schools are organizing into several subunits to attain the advantages peculiar to small schools. In either situation, the purpose should be to introduce those changes and innovations which will facilitate improvement in learning and will give pupils the opportunity to experience self-direction and assume more responsibility for their behavior and learning.

Evanston Township High School since 1924 has been developing and refining a different model for the organization structure of a large secondary school. The focus of the school's concern for the past half century has been to effect an organization that will solve many of the problems characteristic of a large complex school. This is done by capitalizing on the resources and strengths of a large school and at the same time gaining the advantages that may be associated with a small school. The schools-within-a-school concept seeks to ensure the personal understanding of and attention to each student within a small school setting while utilizing fully the assets of diversity and specialization possible only in a very large high school. Thus it is believed that the opportunities for each student to become personally involved in the life of the school and to receive an education most appropriate for him will be greatly increased.

Evanston Township High School is organized as four semi-independent schools, each with its own identity, student body of 1,200, faculty, and physical facilities. The organization seeks to make the best possible use of staff, facilities, and instructional resources in a harmonious and effective relationship among the several autonomous units and the total school. The measure of the success of this organization will be the degree to which the excellence of teaching and learning is improved, the educational experiences of students are humanized, and the individual student experiences an education of high quality.

The school is certain that there are ways of dealing creatively with the large complex institution. The best organization for the students may not be the simple, cozy educational environment, but the truly complex one in which students, for example, can be professionals in the performing arts, amateurs in appreciation of the performing arts, or simply nonparticipants if they wish. While the small school, with its undermanned program, may allow or, indeed, require each student to participate, there is a tyranny in this demand and a kind of forced "togetherness" that makes psychologists happy, but may not really represent a superior environment for all students.

This high school, by creating significant subgroups, or schools that have identity and meaning, apparently succeeds in freeing students and faculty so that greater emphasis is placed on the ability of students to attack and solve problems of interest and meaning to them and in moving toward the position where students accept greater responsibility for their own learning. As Evanston Township High School succeeds in this objective, it will have moved to another and higher level of accomplishment and other school districts may have an alternate and perhaps better model for the organization of a secondary school.

The idea of the educational park is another model that is receiving much attention by some educators and the public. This plan provides for an organization with up to 30,000 pupils at various levels of schooling. It seeks to provide much better person-to-person contacts between teachers and students and to attain equality of educational opportunity at a new high level for many thousands of young people. The advocates of such parks claim that, if properly planned and organized, these approaches can help rather than hinder the humanizing of students and teachers.

Staffing

A third approach to humanizing the secondary school is a more flexible and efficient use of personnel, time, and facilities.

First as to personnel. Currently there are no acceptable standards for defining the "best" staffing pattern for a school. Staffing allocations are too frequently not influenced by the needs and interests of a particular student population. How many professional staff members in relation to a given number of students are needed and how shall they be deployed and for what instructional purposes? What is the desirable ratio between classroom teachers and specialists with supportive and evaluative functions? Can the number of professional personnel be significantly reduced as a result of the reorganization of staffing patterns through the use of large-group instruction and technological aids when the purpose of instruction is essentially to impart information?

This is a critical area in the improvement of teaching and learning. The present concept in most schools is still that almost everything done in a school outside the maintenance and administrative functions must be done by fully certified teachers. Until very recently there was little or no differentiation in staff responsibilities in most secondary schools. Teachers are commonly interchangeable. A teacher is a teacher is a teacher. Promotions are away from students. It is a strange kind of profession in which all promotions are away from the clients that are served.

If we are to humanize the high school we must rethink and redefine the role of teachers. Schools should be organized so that teachers can make optimum use of their individual abilities and receive optimum satisfaction. In most schools, because of the omnibus role of teachers and the prevalent standards of teaching load, it is difficult for teachers to find the time and energy to do those tasks that should be characteristic of professional workers. Organizational changes must be effected that provide teachers with more time during the school day to prepare better, to keep up-to-date in their subject field, to confer with colleagues, to work as needed with individual students, and to improve student evaluation techniques when reporting. Dwight Allen asserts that the educational system must be reanalyzed to allow new alternatives to staff use, alternatives which technology can enhance, and alternatives which lead to a more humane use of staff resources and their interaction with and use by students.

If the quality of teaching for meaning is to be materially improved in our schools, traditional staffing patterns must change and many innovations in the better utilization of both professional and nonprofessional persons introduced. The principal must be the key person in this effort at focusing teachers' attention and effort not only on the *what* but on the *how* of teaching.

Scheduling

A few schools are greatly extending scheduling procedures which permit flexibility and effectiveness of the time element by both teachers and students. We make at least two false assumptions about time in most of our secondary schools: (a) the same uniform period, usually 45 to 50 minutes, is equally appropriate for a wide variety of learning activities, and (b) all learners in a class are capable of mastering the same subject matter in the same length of time. Today many good ideas and innovations in secondary schools are barred because they cannot be scheduled. The restrictive manually constructed schedule is still the determiner of the allocation and use of time in most high schools, but more schools are adopting a computer-generated flexible schedule. For what purposes?

Time should not be the end but the means through which greater flexibility and efficiency in its use can contribute to improved teaching and learning. The main objective to be achieved by flexible scheduling should be the individualization of the learning process. This individualization can be related to all the elements in instruction: the pupil, the teacher, the subject, and spaces. New time arrangements for students and teachers are viable. Possibilities may range from the present 30 students for 50 minutes, five days each week, to virtually any time and size variations of a basic structural model of five or more students and 15 or more minutes. Nearly any desired teaching configuration can be scheduled. A reasonable and usable amount of unscheduled time for independent study by students can be provided. After careful professional deliberation and planning, many new modes for teaching and learning can be developed.

A decreasing amount of factual transmission from teacher to student will provide more time to individualize instruction. Variation in interest and ability on the part of individual learners will be less controlled by the pattern of time uniformity. Greater provision for independent and individual study can be made. Lloyd Trump and Delmas Miller [3] define independent study as "the activities in which pupils engage when their teachers stop talking." New emphasis on inquiry, creative and critical thinking, self-direction, and responsibility for learning can result if students are permitted to spend less time on listening and more time on being human.

Facilities for Learning

Good facilities are important factors in the improvement of the learning environment. A school building is not just a shelter, it is a tool for teaching and learning. Learning resources centers for students and instructional materials centers for teachers should be essential spaces in new and renovated school plants. Adequate, functional facilities with a high degree of flexibility can create an open, adaptable kind of environment that lends itself to new concepts in the organization of teaching and learning. The limitations at present of "egg crate" allocation of space are well known. Viewing the curriculum and instruction as a function of space has provided the opportunity for the development of new, imaginative course structures, for large-group presentations, small-group discussions in small spaces, and independent and individual study in a resource center or at a carrel in many places throughout the building.

---

[3] J. Lloyd Trump and Delmas F. Miller. *Secondary School Curriculum Improvement*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1968. p. 265.

The Teacher

The teacher is the most important person in any effort to humanize the school and to lessen the forces of alienation and depersonalization. I sense many situations that do not point in this direction. Today a spirit of aggressiveness, militancy, and dissatisfaction has swept across the ranks of the teaching profession. Don Davies summarizes one of their chief demands: "We want to have a more important part in managing our own affairs, in making decisions about what shall be taught, how, when, by whom, and under what conditions." [4]

Professional negotiations in an increasing number of school districts, without any involvement of principals and only occasionally of superintendents, include much more than requests for increased salaries, fringe benefits, and grievance procedures. Leslee J. Bishop,[5] has effectively identified the trend toward collective negotiations in curriculum and instruction.

Many agreements state that teachers have the right and responsibility to participate and share in the development of educational policy and procedures that influence the program of the school system and their classrooms. A recently adopted negotiation agreement in a New York school district, and there are many other examples, clearly establishes a new role for the teacher. The agreement states:

---

[4] Don Davies. "EPDA—What's in It for Us?" Speech delivered at one of the informal meetings at the NEA Convention in Dallas, July 1-6, 1968.

[5] Leslee J. Bishop. *Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction: Questions and Concerns.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967.

> Teacher Association shall discuss, participate in, and/or negotiate on the following matters of material concern: recruitment of teachers, teacher turnover, in-service training, teaching assignments, teaching conditions, class size, curriculum, district planning, budget preparation, school calendar, salaries, communications, protection of teachers, leaves of absence, general absence provisions, sabbatical leave or other fringe benefits, dues deductions, grievance procedures, and other matters which affect the quality of the education program and morale of the teaching staff.

This particular board of education (and many more are falling in line) agreed that their teachers were qualified to make significant contributions to educational problems in the district and should assist in the development of policy and program.

Teacher demands, with or without negotiation agreements, are tending to bypass, to blitz the building principal and his leadership role and to support a traditional and less useful model of the school. Strong pressures in many school districts are being exercized to narrow and to regiment the tasks of teachers, compensation, class size, teacher load, and other working conditions. The effect of these demands, already present in many school systems, may seriously deter staff involvement in curriculum and instructional improvement, and the diffusion of promising practices in the allocation and utilization of time and personnel in school betterment.

What are the alternatives if the teacher organization is to have major responsibility for curriculum development and instructional improvement? It seems evident that the roles of teachers, principals, supervisors, and curriculum workers might change dramatically if, when teachers enter the decision-making process, they also assume a commitment for implementation. Some of us have believed that it is essential that the principal, in his leadership role, assisted by central office specialists, work continuously with teachers to help them identify, prepare, and evaluate new approaches to curriculum and instruction. I can find less of this professional activity being done by principals and much more evidence of written agreements which write the principal off as an educational leader and leave a serious void in the leadership function.

The Student in the Organization

Finally, the individual student is the focus of our concern as we consider alternate ways of organizing our secondary schools and their instructional programs. New concepts of independent study and individualized instruction emphasize the critical need for the continuous development of responsibility on the part of the individual learner rather than what Dwight W. Allen terms "a demanded metamorphosis at the time of college entrance or vocational employment." The goal of education must be self-direction and self-realization. Young people in high school must become more active in learning, more involved intellectually, more independent of teachers.

Schools must encourage students to believe that they come to school to learn rather than to be taught. Today's society is a learning society. Learning is essential not only to enter the society but to maintain one's position in it. The inculcation of the desire to learn and the teaching of effective methods of inquiry and decision making are probably the most important outcomes that students can learn from their experiences in high school. The school must improve its role as a contributor to the student's lifelong learning process. It must build learning expectations in youth that have deep meaning and personal significance and that transcend their current roles as students and emphasize the need for learning throughout adult life.

The implications for organization and administration are obvious. There must be much more interaction and participation by students in school life. Many more opportunities for self-direction and responsibility must be afforded students. The innovative secondary school must guarantee commitment and involvement of students in every phase of the educational endeavor. This is a new dimension in our commitment to a higher quality of secondary education for all youth.

Building Leadership Skills*

John L. Wallen

John Wallen, as a social psychologist outside the school setting, challenges secondary school leaders with such questions as these:

1. Can we humanize anybody but ourselves?

2. What difference would it make if people were more personal, more genuine, and less role-like as they interact in the school?

3. Can a teacher be a person and play a role at the same time, and can the role be separated from the person?

A major part of Dr. Wallen's discussion centers around making the performance of a role more fulfilling by seeing to it that the role is compatible with the "style of person you are." "We must," he says, "find how to help school administrators act in ways with a higher probability of being helpful to other people." This, he maintains, requires "some kind of an educational context and experience in which an individual can be helped to discover the constructive aspects of his own behavior in relation to other people." He is

---

*** An edited printscript of an address presented at the Secondary Education Council Conference, "Humanizing Secondary Schools," St. Louis, Missouri, November 1-4, 1967.**

alarmed by the scant attention given to "practicing how to perform better," and he suggests that it might be possible to build into the school structure ways of looking at "how we operate as a team."

Dr. Wallen gives many illustrations of ways in which National Training Laboratories techniques have been useful when applied to the school setting. His approach is sensitive and gives insight into what can be done when school administrators and teachers genuinely cooperate with expert leadership in learning better ways of working together.—N.K.H.

HOW many secondary school leaders at some time have experienced laboratory training? It might have been called "sensitivity training"; it might have been a group at one of the National Training Laboratories like Bethel, or Cedar City, or Lake Arrowhead.

How many secondary leaders enjoy the music played by the Jefferson Airplane, the Buffalo Springfield, The Grateful Dead, or "Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band"? To how many secondary principals are those names strange and unfamiliar?

I ask these questions because the theme I will develop here relates to a kind of experience of learning which grows out of laboratory training, and because readers of this booklet who happen to be secondary school people deal daily with the people who like the Jefferson Airplane and the Buffalo Springfield. I really wonder as I raise these questions if part of any secondary conference should not have time set aside for listening to the words that these groups sing in their songs. Here we are speaking about a question of humanizing, and the theme that I see being repeated over and over in many of these songs is a desperate request that somebody let them become human. I do not know whether I can remember exactly, but the Buffalo Springfield has one song ending with "Those of us who run to catch a moment in the sun always seem to find we weren't supposed to run."[1] Another phrase from that song is "Finding what you sought with all the time you bought leaves you with the thought that perhaps you've just been bought."[2] I suspect that maybe some of us, too, feel that way.

I have heard a lot of discussion about humanizing the student. As a matter of fact, I hear so much discussion that the word begins

[1] Stephen Sills, songwriter. "Everybody's Wrong." Ten East Music and Springale Tunes. *Buffalo Springfield.* ATCO Record #SD33-200.

[2] *Ibid.*

to lose meaning for me. While I listen to talk about this process in rather general terms, I suddenly feel that the key is that *you cannot humanize anybody but yourself*, and I think that this is where we must start.

With all the talk about how we are going to humanize other people, I would like to put the shoe on another foot and say, how humane are your interactions? I guess I would give another slogan to remember—possibly a cliché. Some may be familiar with Marshall McLuhan's [3] work on understanding media in which he says "The medium is the message." He goes on to point out that far and above what television has to present, television itself as a medium is a different kind of message. He gives as an example that, when the child who has grown up watching television is presented with print, he looks at the page and tries to get the message from the whole page as he does with television. He has learned a certain attitude toward how you get experience. Reading is a very different kind of thing. I do not want to belabor McLuhan's point, but I believe that when you come to the question of humanizing the school, *the person is the message.*

I am no specialist on curriculum; I do not know anything about the use of space in schools; I do not know anything about scheduling in modular blocks or flexible schedules. Yet I do have a very strong conviction that the place in which any child will develop his potentialities as a person is through contact with somebody who is more than a role—*who is himself a person!*

The Person and the Role

If I asked you to write three sentences beginning with the word "I," some of you would write sentences of this type: "I am a teacher." "I am a principal." "I am a man." "I am a husband." "I'm an American." Others would write: "I feel resentful at having to write this." "I'm anxious to go home." "I wish this were over." "I feel good today."

These two types of responses point up a distinction between the person as a role and the person as a person. This distinction between the role and the person is a crucial one when dealing with the question of humanizing secondary education.

When you go to the restaurant and the waitress comes and

[3] Marshall McLuhan. *Understanding Media.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964.

takes your order, you deal with her as a role, essentially. You do not really care what her name is; you do not really care whether she is married or single; you do not really care how many children she has or whether she left home crying this morning because her husband said something unkind to her. You do not really care very much as long as she gets your food to you on time and does not overcharge you. In short, as long as she performs within the role there is a satisfactory relationship established. Likewise, we may say she does not really care about you as a person. You are the other complementary role, the customer. The waitress waits on the customer, and there is a very restricted and circumscribed set of behaviors that can take place between the two of you.

All of us have roles that we play in life. Some roles have a high degree of deference in them as, for instance, a bellboy, but whatever they are, they are impersonal. Do not be mistaken—I do not want to say we should never play roles, for obviously that is impossible. What I am speaking about is the fact that a role, in many cases, tends to swallow up and destroy our quality of being a person, our personality; and to the extent that this happens, we have less humane interactions with other people because the interaction is often dictated by the role and not by the fact that persons are simply present at a given moment and relating to each other.

There are several ways in which a person differs from a role. First, a person has uniqueness, a sense of self—self-identity, self-concept. There is a flavor to a person; he has a style. The role implies that the behavior should be interchangeable. Anybody else, put into that role, should be able to operate and carry out the requirements of the position. Second, the person wants the feeling that he runs his own life; he is not a puppet; he is not manipulated; he is not directed or coerced by others. A third characteristic of the person, and the one to be emphasized in our work and in everyday life, is that a person can reason and process information logically and arrive at conclusions which may be more or less sound.

Roles Within the School

More important to me in looking at the person is the fact that he has feelings; he feels anger, joy, affection, sadness, humiliation, surprise, discouragement—the gamut of emotion. Yet the part that I usually find missing in our interactions is the ability to deal with feelings, both mine and those of the other person.

We should begin by thinking about the roles within the school systems. We have a principal, which is a role; we have a teacher, which is a role; we have a student, which is a role; and much of what takes place in the schools is an attempt to keep each person in his role as others see it. For instance, if the teachers are accustomed to a principal role which is rather directive and a principal comes in who would like to have more of a free-swinging school with more responsibility and initiative taken in the classroom, he encounters all kinds of resistance. He is not being a good principal because he is not fulfilling the expectations that the teachers have of his role. In short, any time you violate role expectation, the other person becomes somewhat uneasy because he does not know how to deal with the situation. Each of us is much more comfortable as long as each one predictably stays within his role, but the role itself is dehumanizing.

Sidney Jourard's book, *The Transparent Self*,[4] stresses the point that failure or inability to know one's real self can make one ill. He is talking about self-alienation. His book makes reference to nurses. My observations from the work I have done with nurses and physicians convince me that the role has swallowed up so much of their person that there is literally little person left. They now have this professional mannerism, "Well, have we had our orange juice this morning?" Jourard says that they have repressed or suppressed much of their own real or spontaneous reactions to experience and that they replace their spontaneous behavior with carefully censored behavior which conforms to a rigid role definition or a highly limited self-concept. They behave as they should behave and feel what they should feel. When roles or self-concepts exclude too much of what he calls "real self," a person soon experiences certain symptoms such as vague anxiety or depression, and sometimes boredom.

If the person has come to neglect the needs and feelings of his body, then such physical symptoms as unwarranted fatigue, headaches, and digestive upsets will arise. So each of us pays a price for not being able to be truly himself.

Would people in schools act any differently if they responded as they really felt about what takes place in the school? What kinds of differences, if any, would you expect to find if people were to be more personal, more genuine, and less role-like as they interact in the school? Think about faculty meetings, about conferences between a principal and a teacher, and about student-teacher interaction.

---

[4] Sidney M. Jourard. *The Transparent Self*. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1964.

Can a teacher be a person and play a role at the same time? Can one separate role from person? Why cannot the person modify and influence his role so that his personality is expressed in his performance? Does being a person mean that each expresses whatever he feels when he feels it, even if at the expense of dignity? Does playing a role produce boredom? What is the difference between role and function? Are these words synonymous?

The Position and the Role

When we speak of a position we think of the particular duties that the individual has to carry out in that position, the things that he must do. When we speak of a role we speak of the expectations that others have of him. It is very much like the situation in a play, a drama. A teacher once said to me, "I can't go into a liquor store without feeling guilty because somebody will see me and they'll hear that a teacher has bought liquor." This feeling very much points out awareness of the perception of the community's expectations, but it does not have anything to do with the duties of filling the position of being a teacher. It has no relation to whether he is a good teacher or a poor teacher. It has to do with the way he feels in relation to the rest of the community, and the way the community might feel about him.

There is a continuing reference to the relation between the role and the person. I think that what needs to be isolated is the key problem that we all face—how to make our performance within our role fulfilling and meaningful to ourselves. That is the problem the student has—how he can fulfill his role as a student in a way which is personally meaningful to him. He is not going to stop being a student; that is a role in which he is cast when he comes into the school. Yet can he be a person as a student, and can the teacher be a person as a teacher?

If you have read a recent article by Carl Rogers[5] you are familiar with this point of view. His article alerts me to that kind of education in which the interaction between persons is most delicate, namely, in psychotherapy. The general trend in the field at the present time is for the therapist to get away from techniques, to stop hiding behind a nondirective mask, to stop simply reflecting what is going on outside, to stop only interpreting behavior and, instead, to start to interact as he himself is at this particular moment. Ten years ago a psychotherapist would never have said, "I don't see where this is getting us; I'm so bored with what you're telling me I can hardly stay awake." This would be much more apt to happen with a therapist today, and it may be that he will get the response that one person gave a therapist who said this, "I'm so glad you said that because I'm bored, too."

---

[5] Carl R. Rogers. "The Interpersonal Relationship in the Facilitation of Learning." In: *Humanizing Education: The Person in the Process.* Robert R. Leeper, editor. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967. pp. 1-18.

Toward Being a Person

Over and over again I am reminded of the story of "The Emperor's New Clothes." It is a kind of mutual charade which is what an excessive emphasis upon role enactment does to us. My favorite story along this line is of the husband and wife who had been planning for many, many years to take a trip abroad, but they never could find the time. Finally, the husband came home and he said, "Well, dear, I think I have things in such shape that we can take six months off this summer and go to Europe for the trip we have always wanted to take. Is it going to be okay with you?" She said, "I have been waiting for ten years. This is fine." The husband looked through the doorway across to another room where he saw a little old gray-haired lady knitting and rocking, and he said, "While we are away you will have to find someone to take care of your mother." The wife said, "I thought she was your mother!"

The condition that makes that kind of situation possible is pluralistic ignorance—when each person does not know something but thinks he is the only one who does not know. I submit that many of the difficulties in schools stem from this kind of situation. Everybody at a faculty meeting may be bored, may be feeling it is a waste of time, but each thinks that he is the only one. Besides, a good teacher should not say this, or a good principal should not say that; thus they go on enacting a charade which results in wasting everybody's time and in increasing the tension in the school. Nobody cares enough to get up and say, "I'm bored; I wonder if anybody else is."

If people were to be more themselves as persons, would there be more hurt feelings? I think this is probably true, but what do we do when we relate to other people? A great deal of our effort goes into avoiding hurting feelings or having them hurt. If the proper climate is established, hurt feelings are the first step in learning, for if we spend all of our time protecting ourselves from having hurt feelings, we will never find out why our feelings were hurt, and that is where inquiry starts.

When we relate with others, should there always be the element of complete trust? In order to be involved interpersonally, do we have to open all the intimate avenues of our private feelings? Openness with other people is not an end in itself; it is a means to an end. In many cases we are not open with the other person because of a lack of concern for him. In Herbert Thelen's article [6] he introduces the definition of *humane interaction* as an interaction that would be enlightened and compassionate; an interaction that is based upon caring; but I think that he did not stress sufficiently another aspect of caring which might be misinterpreted as only sentimental kindness or superficial affection.

A person who learns how to use his own angry feelings instead of withdrawing in anger is indicating a concern. I know my wife cares for me when she is willing to tell me how angry she is about something I have just done. What it says to me is, "I don't like the way things are going, and we can't work it out unless you know what my reaction is." On the other hand, when she becomes angry and withdraws, this is a far more difficult situation, because at that point the contact has been broken. I am not saying that at all times—in order to be a person—you must express all the feelings you have. But one ought to be able to express those feelings that are *relevant* to the other person's performance.

I look upon human feelings, particularly negative feelings because we have most difficulty with negative feelings, as key factors in human relationships. They play what I call the fuse-function in interpersonal relations. When you build a house, you just do not put the same capacity in all the wiring. You put in one part of the wiring which is more apt to burn out; that is the fuse. When the fuse blows, you then check the circuit to find out where the overload is and correct it. This is the function that anger, depression, boredom, irritation, and resentment play in interpersonal relations. Before a relationship goes completely sour, before it goes completely bad, before trust is completely broken, one or the other or both parties will begin to experience some kind of negative feelings. If you ignore these feelings and say, "No good teacher has these kinds of feelings, or no good administrator has these kinds of feelings," you are ignoring the fact that the fuse is blown. This indicates that there is something wrong in the relationship and that you had better check your communication circuits.

---

[6] See Thelen's chapter, pp. 17ff.

If administrators react to feelings in this way, it is possible to say to a teacher, "You know, I am really becoming quite concerned and would like to discuss what this means for the ways we are working together." It may be that he will discover, as a principal, that he is doing certain kinds of things which lead to the behavior of the teacher. It may be that the teacher will modify his behavior or that neither will modify their behaviors, but that each will understand the other better as a person. This cannot occur without the use of negative feelings as a signal.

Several years ago an experience brought home to me, rather vividly, the poverty of our behavior in our roles. At a time when I was serving as a clinical psychologist, I received a call from a young man who said that he had a difficult family situation. He wondered if I would be willing to sit in with the family while they had a meeting. I accepted. We gathered in the home of the elderly mother, whom we will call Mrs. Johnson. There were the grown son and daughter, who were talking about a third child who was a grown daughter, Dorothy. Dorothy had gotten to the point where she would have to go to the state mental hospital, and the task that the son and daughter were attempting to undertake was to explain to the mother what was going to happen. They anticipated that she would be very upset by this and would not permit it.

As we gathered, there was a rather tense and strained conversation for a half hour during which nobody brought up anything relevant to Dorothy's situation. The mother then said, "I think I'll prepare some coffee and cookies." When she went out, the two who were left said, "You tell her." "No, you tell her." So, when she came back in, I started the conversation by saying, "I understand that there was a reason for this meeting; I wonder if we can get to it."

The son immediately began to describe what the psychiatrist said about Dorothy and what needed to be done. I still have the picture of the mother looking like a pioneer woman—white hair, very erect, sitting in her rocking chair with her hands folded in her lap. She did not respond at all as they expected her to. She did not break down; instead, she merely asked, "Who is going to go to the hospital with her?" The son said, "Well, the attendants will meet her at the psychiatrist's office, and they'll take her to the hospital." The mother replied, "Do you mean a member of our family is going to the hospital without another member of the family with her?" At this point, the son said, "Well, yes, I get the point, Mom. I'll go with her." There was some further discussion and the arrangements were worked out. If the reader had been watching, he would have thought, "What a stalwart person this old lady is!"

To this day I do not know why I did it, but after the meeting was over and as we were walking to the door, she walked past me, and I found myself putting my arms out. She put her head on my chest and she sobbed and sobbed. Now, this was not part of the role of being a psychologist, but it was important for her. I know it was important for me because of the tension we had been under that evening. I have a suspicion it may have been important to her son and daughter also who could not reach out to her. Things like this are not planned. You do not make a plot of it and say, "Now two minutes of hand-holding." It is a response which comes from the person, and as I reflected on it, I had to struggle with the fact that I felt guilty for having done what I did. What psychiatrist or psychologist goes around embracing his clients?

Are You "For Real"?

Can you trust your own impulses? Do you feel that "your self" will be constructive to other people? At this point, we run into a dilemma that we ought to face. I am not attempting to say that if everybody were always to be open and express his feelings and respond as he feels, this would be the best of all possible worlds. There are many of us who would be very cruel, very hurtful if we were to be ourselves. We cannot just be sincere and be ourselves. We do know that there are certain ways of behaving which are more apt to be helpful to other people than other ways. Why do we not develop a method in which we can train people in these ways of behaving? Yet that would be to deny each person's individuality. The behavior is not helpful if it is not *your* behavior. The behavior is not helpful if it is a mask, if it is a gimmick, if it is not sincere. So, we face the dilemma of how to be spontaneously the kind of person who will be helpful to the other person.

One of the things you will find when you begin to depart from your role, or to remake it into a role which is compatible with the style of person you are, is the question you are asked in one way or another, "Are you for real?" I get asked that with regard to my beard, for instance. Many people, when they feel free enough, will ask if I have a beard because I am a psychologist, or if it is a gimmick to get some kind of response from the audience. The last thing that enters their minds is that my wife and daughter might like it.

When you act in a way which does not fit the stereotype or role expectation, you may expect that other people will begin to question, "Are you for real?" When a teacher leans over Johnny at his desk and says, "Johnny, that is an excellent paper you have done," Johnny really has to ask himself the question, "Is he for real, or is this just his way to manipulate me to get me to do something else?" It is very different, for instance, from a teacher's really speaking for himself by saying, "I liked what you wrote. It was meaningful to me."

I had a lab experience with a nursing staff of 25. We worked in small groups. I assumed right at the begining, of course, that since we were going to be working closely together, we would be on a first-name basis. I said, "As soon as you feel comfortable, drop the name Dr. Wallen and refer to me as John. I feel so much more comfortable on this basis, and I'll expect to take the same liberties with you." I then discovered that some of these people who had worked together for 15 years did not know each other's first name. In the hospital they had always been Miss Jones or Miss Smith. Some had never seen each other in street clothes—only in uniform. It became a central issue in the group which contained the staff's administrator. They could not feel comfortable calling her Betty, even though the administrator said, "I'm perfectly comfortable in being called Betty."

There was all of this old residual feeling about the role. Well, they worked that through and by the time the conference was over, these old role stereotypes had disappeared and they began to discover that all of them had areas in which they felt inadequate. Each had ways in which her feelings were hurt. All had experiences which made them feel angry. They became able to express affection for each other much more openly. But the thing that intrigued me was that the administrator called me a couple of weeks later and said, "I had occasion the other day to call one of the head nurses to say I wanted to have a conference with her. The head nurse said, 'Okay, is this going to be a "Betty" conference?' " That was the trend they developed for talking as persons, each with a stake in the situation—not just in some kind of role jockeying.

Laboratory Training

I have mentioned laboratory training. I would like to say more about it because if you think about the dilemma I have just mentioned (the dilemma of being yourself, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, of acting in ways with a higher probability of being helpful and more constructive to other people), the whole question of how you learn this type of behavior is extremely important. You cannot learn it by drill or rote, as I have said before. This could destroy your individuality. On the other hand, you cannot simply say, "Find it out for yourself," because you may spend the next 100 years and not find it out.

We must have some kind of an educational context and experience in which an individual can be helped to discover the constructive aspects of his own behavior in relation to other people. That is essentially what is meant by the laboratory method of interpersonal relations or human relations training. We sometimes call it *experiential learning,* or we sometimes speak of it as *communication by experience* and not just by words. The key essence of laboratory training (learning) is that you examine the behavior that occurs in the learning situation and try to find out what it means, and that any particular thing that happens, any interaction, is fair game. This requires the development of a kind of skill that most of us do not have. And this, I would emphasize, may be the central point of this chapter.

When we talk about developing leadership, the central skill that I think the instructional leader must develop is the ability to talk about behavior as it occurs, or shortly thereafter. The factor which will make a difference between one year of experience as a principal on the one hand, repeated 18 times, and 18 years of experience as a principal, on the other, is the ability to learn from that experience. You learn by examining it. Any particular thing which happens in a lab is grist for the mill. In a typical T-Group (training group), for instance, an unstructured style of leadership is used. Perhaps twelve people get together and the leader may say, "We're here to learn about human behavior; we're here to learn how people interact; we're here to learn about ourselves. We can go about this any way we please. I will not be a lecturer; I will not be an instructor; I am not the chairman of this group. When I have skills that are helpful, I will try to make contributions that will be helpful."

Then he sits back and the group becomes totally unstructured. Participants usually begin to become somewhat anxious and the people do what they typically do when they become anxious. There are some who start to talk a lot because that is the way they handle their anxieties. There are others who withdraw and do nothing, because that is the way they handle *their* anxieties. This behavior then becomes the material that they will examine to try to see what it tells them.

Typically, there is an increasing dissatisfaction, and as people get more and more dissatisfied, they handle their anger and dissatisfaction the way they typically handle it. Those who withdraw when they get angry, withdraw and have their feelings hurt; those who blast out and attack, blast out and attack. Again, the lab consultant will ask them to look at what is happening in the lab situation and how they feel about it at that time. Gradually, the structure begins to develop in the group and they begin to learn how to interact, and they learn which of their behaviors are helpful and which of their behaviors are destructive. Nobody tells them how they should change, but they get information about how other people see them, and how other people respond to them, and they are able to take that information into account.

The kind of skill that a principal ought to develop is the kind of skill that would enable him to sit down with teachers and talk about what happens between them. For example, a little incident was reported to me recently by a principal which is typical of the kinds of problems he was currently worrying about. It seems that there was a piano in one of the homerooms, and the music teacher wanted to use the piano in the afternoon, but another teacher was using the room. I asked if he really cared how the problem was solved as long as the people involved were satisfied, and he said that he did not. So I suggested that his role then was to enable the people to solve it and not to solve it for them. But the question that comes back is, does he have the kind of skills that would enable him to sit down with those involved, not as the heavy who is going to make the decision, but as one who is going to help them understand what the goals of the school are in relation to students, and to see how they arrive at the kind of decision that would work for them?

Another teacher came to me after being in an interpersonal relations group to say his whole style of dealing with children had shifted in one regard. Before, when Susy came up to tell him that Billy had hit her, he would go to Billy to find out what the situation was. Now, he says, what I do is to get Billy and Susy to sit down together and they work it out, so that Susy is encouraged to tell Billy how she feels about what he did to her, and Billy is encouraged to tell Susy what he thought happened. In short, the teacher moved away from a pattern in which he played a highly directive role all the time to one in which he played a facilitative role by asking people to look at the way they interact and at what it means to the two of them.

Interpersonal Interactions

Now a few words about the way we as human beings look at our interactions with others. One of the things that appalls me is that we find it so easy to build buildings and so hard to build teams and organizations. Recently in southern Oregon I talked with two principals who had moved into new schools, in which they were going to use team teaching, ungraded classrooms, and an open-building approach. They had teachers who had come from situations in which each had his own classroom and was supreme. Yet when they came together in the new schools there were no walls in the buildings except for a little central office which the teachers had, and they were expected to work together.

The design was beautiful with all kinds of great theory behind it! Yet it is asking the almost impossible to throw six people together and expect them to form a team by themselves, when they have not had the necessary background to form a team. When I commented on this, the principal said, "That's exactly the kind of problem we're getting; we're hearing bickering and fault-finding; and people are running to the principal's office to complain about somebody else."

I heard an example a couple of years ago about a high school where they started team teaching in the English section. They took an excellent teacher and made him the team chairman. The end result was that the team was so ineffective that by the end of the year they had destroyed this person as a classroom teacher. He could no longer go back to his own classroom because he had lost his confidence.

I am continually alarmed and surprised that we know so little about human beings; if we want a committee to work, we simply appoint it and then we drop the members in a room and say, "Now do a job," as if there were no problems of establishing trust, of learning to be open, and of relating to each other.

One of the ways I personally would define the role of the administrator, whether it is that of principal or superintendent, is that he might very well see his job as a coach to those who report to him. I get the impression—I can say this because I am so naïve in the field of education that the reader may forgive me if I am mistaken—for instance, that many principals do not understand the difference between being a teacher in a classroom and being a principal of a school. This may be one of the reasons why the principals do so much with the pupils, and why they have so many pupils coming to their offices, rather than regarding their main responsibility as one of helping teachers to develop humane interactions among themselves as teachers and to be able to learn from each other. You would not have very high regard for a coach who insisted on playing quarterback on his own team. He is expected to teach the quarterback how to operate the team. We have the most respect for a coach who is able to train people so that the quarterback really runs the game without having to have all the signals given from the bench. I think the same thing is important in a manager's job.

I have been impressed with a recent article about a professional football team. The writer pointed out that every Saturday they take movies of their game and they study these in detail, even though they are not going to play the same opponent next weekend. They study, look at their own interactions, and see which kinds of interactions might be improved; then they spend all week practicing and improving for a new opponent. I suddenly became aware of the fact that here is an instance in which a collection of human beings spend about 95 percent of their time practicing how to be a team and only 5 percent performing. Yet, a typical business executive or a typical school administrator spends about 99-44/100 percent of his time performing and the remaining small fraction actually looking at the way he performs and practicing how to perform better.

I suggest that it might be possible to build in, with appropriate help, some ways of looking at "How well do we operate as a team?" "How well do we interact?" I hear complaints from teachers about such mundane things as the fact that every teacher handles playground duty or hall duty in a different way. So, the teacher who tends to be more strict gets the hard looks from some of the pupils because someone else is too lax, and the end result is that the child has to learn to adjust to five or ten different sets of standards.

I would say that one of the responsibilities in a school, if you are really concerned about humanizing, is to help develop a climate which is consistent in some way. That is, the principal, as a leader, needs to find ways to help the teachers develop common understandings. What happens when a teacher shows up a half-hour late for duty, and somebody else has to take it and is upset about it? How do they handle that? Do they discuss it among themselves, or do they merely build up hard feelings, or do they go to the principal and complain? All of these are very important things with regard to the climate of the school.

Climate for Humaneness

What would be a climate conducive to developing fully functioning human beings? We have some guides to this matter from the work of Chris Argyris in the Yale School of Industrial Management.[7] He describes three basic kinds of norms that ought to exist in a good climate. I will not use the same terms he does, but they are adapted from his formulation. The first is the norm of *openness,* which he calls *individuality.* Here you have a range, from openness on the one hand, to closedness on the other hand. By openness we mean that people are able to report their feelings about what is relevant. The second norm he calls *concern.* I prefer to call it *receptivity,* and at the opposite end of receptivity is indifference or antagonism. To what extent do I want to know what you see in my behavior? To what extent do I want to know what you feel? To what extent am I interested in your problems? In short, am I receptive to your being open?

The third norm he calls *trust,* but I think it is more clearly described as a *risk-taking* norm. The spirit is "Let's try it and find out." At the opposite end would be "Let's not rock the boat; let's play it safe." You can imagine, then, a school in which the principal has built and helped the teachers to build norms in which they were *open* with each other, in which they were *receptive* to each other, and in which it was the norm to *take risks* and try out things and evaluate them instead of playing it safe. This is a picture of the kind of school in which the children would be open and receptive and also risk-taking.

---

[7] Chris Argyris. *Organization and Innovation.* Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1965.

Recently two principals said to me, "We feel that more important than the new building we are moving into is the staff that we move in. Will you help us put on something that will enable us to begin to build a kind of open inquiry into the way we work together, that will enable us to work better together? In short, can we have some kind of practice at being a team before we have to go onto the field?" They did not have much money and the conditions under which we had to carry out the workshop were far from the best. They were able to find an old, abandoned army barracks, which is owned by a college and is kept for a few summer courses. The teachers worked all day Thursday, and drove two hours, without dinner, to come to this abandoned army camp, with the desolate wind sweeping in from the ocean. They came in to find a cold meal of potato salad and cold meat. Many of them had been resistant to coming. One of the fellows said, "You know, the only reason I'm here is because I respect my principal. I don't think there is any benefit in this, and I am quite resistant to the whole idea."

The principal was willing to stick his neck out; he believed in the idea. We all stuck our necks out. You can imagine the moods of these people as they came in. I was intrigued by one of the young teachers who said to us, about a day and a half later, "When I came that first night, I was tired; I'd never seen such a God-forsaken place; the beds were lousy; there were too many women for too few showers. Everything was wrong, and the thing that I wanted most was to go home and have a bath and go to bed. I didn't know what the program was going to be; I was scared to death about all this unknown. Now that I've been here for a day and a half, you know, I'm delighted that I don't know what's going to happen this afternoon.

For three days, morning—afternoon—evening, during scheduled sessions and free time, at meals—at work—at play, we became our own laboratory in humane relations. Our own interactions created the subject matter for our inquiry in which we were simultaneously participants and observers. In many different activities occurring spontaneously or by prior planning we followed the three steps of laboratory inquiry: act—understand—apply. (a) *Act:* Our interactions provided shared, or public, data. (b) *Understand:* We described what happened and tried to understand it by finding out what each person had seen, how he felt about it, what he thought influenced him to act as he did, how he reacted to the actions of others. Thus, the private data from individuals supplied meaning to the public data. (c) *Apply:* Each person drew conclusions (emotional as well as intellectual) for himself and tried these out in new situations. The group drew conclusions about itself as a group and about how to move toward more humane interactions.

Over the three days the norms within these school faculties moved toward openness, receptivity, and toward a willingness to take risks in trying new ways of relating to others. People began to experience themselves and act as persons rather than restricting their behavior to what they believed was appropriate to the role of "teacher."

By the end of the workshop this group had developed such an open climate that the members were reluctant to leave. They were now expressing some fear—"I'm afraid we'll lose this when we get back home." Another of the changes that took place over this period of time was that they were now able to express affection openly, which they had never been able to express before. For them, it was a great element of support to know that they could be themselves with the other people in this particular group.

One last vignette, which was very touching to me: One of the assistant principals was talking to me, after the conference had broken up, and he was saying that he thought that the last session had been somewhat of a let-down. We had been talking about carry-over back home. "Gee, there just weren't many ideas. It was so passive; not much interaction. I wonder why that is?" At this particular point, I looked over and saw one of the older teachers, I suppose in her late fifties. She had given the appearance of being a bold sort of person—a good sport and a good egg. She came over and said with feeling, "This is the first time in five years since my husband died that I felt that anybody cared about me." I turned to the assistant principal and I said, "Can you see why they weren't interested in talking about carry-over back home?"

Training in Human Relations

I used to think that achieving change was just a matter of freeing people to be themselves. I now really feel that one must create the right kind of educational situation to bring about change. You may say, "Well, some of this has been interesting to me. I'd like to know more about it. I'm not thoroughly sold that this is the way to go, but there's something to speculate about. What could I do?"

The first thing that I would suggest is that if you have not attended a human relations laboratory or a sensitivity training laboratory, or an interpersonal relations laboratory, whatever it is called, you ought to attend one for your own education. You can get information about these from the National Training Laboratories.[8] So, the first suggestion I would make is to attend a lab. In the Pacific Northwest we are attempting to develop a program to help schools train the entire faculty and staff in interpersonal relations. One of the requirements is that we will not go into the school unless the principal has had laboratory training. If he does not know what it is all about, the process could be too threatening.

A second suggestion I would make is that you might find out from NTL who the associates are in your neighborhood, and get someone to come in as a consultant to work with you in developing some kind of program of upgrading your own leadership skills and developing the kind of human climate you really want in the school. There are some 350 associates in what we call the NTL network throughout the country.

Another source of assistance is The Human Development Institute[9] in Atlanta, Georgia. The reason I am mentioning The Human Development Institute is that this organization has started an approach that is unique. It has attempted to develop programmed materials for interpersonal relations. Believe it or not, a student of Carl Rogers teamed up with a student of B. F. Skinner, and they decided to use Skinner's method of programmed learning to teach Carl Rogers' concepts of human interrelations. They have made a breakthrough in this by making a programmed book which is intended to be used by two people, carrying them through a series of experiences.

I will summarize by saying that I believe these approaches establish the climate for a trusting relationship and build openness and honesty. Without some such approach which can help school personnel become a team, changes in schools are apt to be administrative in nature without true support and participation by the total staff in identifying and reaching the common goals of the school.

---

[8] National Training Laboratories, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

[9] The Human Development Institute, 34 Old Ivy Road, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia.

Some Characteristics of a Humane Secondary School

J. Galen Saylor

As Norman Hamilton points out in his introductory statement, these papers from the two conferences on the humane secondary school present basic concepts on the nature of humaneness. They also consider ways in which the school may become a better institution for the education of youth in humane terms.

This final presentation is an effort to summarize the papers growing out of the two conferences. It sets forth some of the salient characteristics of a secondary school that truly seeks to foster the fullest possible development of pupils in the humane terms discussed by Monez and Bussiere, Thelen, and Macdonald. The theme of this statement is Monez and Bussiere's query: "What would a secondary school be like if the development of such qualities were a primary goal?"

The qualities of humane secondary schools will be described in four categories:

A. The overarching, pervasive functions and objectives of such a school

B. The administrative structure, policies, and procedures

C. The instructional program

D. The relationships of persons comprising the school community.

The qualities that contribute to the attainment of a humane secondary school are merely suggested in outline form.

A. The Goals To Be Sought:

Basic Concept—*A humane secondary school is one whose total efforts are devoted to the optimum development, in socially approved directions, of the potentialities and capabilities of all adolescents in the community in each of the major aspects of human character and personality.*

1. Such a school has defined adequately its basic purposes, goals, and objectives as behavioral outcomes sought or as additions to behavioral potential.
    a. It uses a taxonomy of objectives that is comprehensive and inclusive of human behavior:
        (1) Knowledges, generalizations, concepts, structures
        (2) Values and attitudes
        (3) Skills
        (4) Self-concepts and motivations
        (5) Ability to cope with environmental situations
        (6) Modes and patterns of behavior and self-direction
        (7) Self-realization and self-actualization in talents and potentialities.
    b. These objectives and goals are the basis for planning all aspects of the school's efforts to educate adolescents.
2. The principal, his staff assistants, and the teachers are fully and deeply committed to the concept of humaneness in the secondary school and there is evidence that such a concept guides their actions.
    a. They have fully discussed and explored the meaning of such a concept.
    b. They evaluate and appraise their individual and collective efforts by the criterion of humaneness.
    c. There is ample evidence that the entire staff believes that every human being has potentialities for greatness and that man is perfectible.

d. The quality of the school, and any aspect of it, is judged by the quality of the people it has helped to shape.

B. Administrative Structure, Policies, and Procedures:

Basic Concept—*A humane secondary school is one in which all organizational, managerial, regulatory, and policy matters are designed solely to achieve, to the optimum degree possible, the goals of a humane program of education.*

1. The organizational structure and practices are fully conducive to optimum development of each adolescent.

a. The grouping of pupils for instruction is so flexible that learning opportunities for each person can be planned on the basis of his individual needs.

b. The formal class schedule of the school is such that an individual teacher or group of teachers may readily plan the use of pupils' time in terms of the particular types of learning activities to be carried on.

c. Pupils are guided in making evaluations of the adequacy of their own development in all aspects of personality and character. They have the opportunity to obtain teachers' evaluations of these same aspects of development.

d. Parents are fully apprised of these evaluations.

2. The school provides the optimum opportunities possible for pupils individually to engage in activities for self-development.

a. Pupils are given as large a measure of self-direction as is feasible on the basis of individual educational plans and their own self-reliance.

b. Adequate facilities and opportunities both of an organized and unorganized nature are provided for self-directed study, for exploration of a variety of types of school programs, or for pursuing individual interests.

c. The school uses a wide variety of tests, appraisal methods, and personality study methods to ascertain the talents and capabilities each adolescent possesses or may develop.

d. The school is open for individual and group activities by adolescents and citizens as much as is feasible throughout the year.

3. The school itself—its board of education, its administrative officers, its staff, its patrons—exemplifies humaneness in its own endeavors and administrative procedures and practices.

    a. The superintendent and school principals support efforts of teachers to develop open-mindedness, inquiry, investigation, and evaluation among pupils, and endeavor to gain public support for such types of pupil behavior.

    b. The school is administered in consonance with humane qualities of organizational life.

4. The administrative structure and organization is such that a group of teachers (school-wide, departmental staff, interdepartmental group, or departmental subgroup), or individual teachers may plan and then carry out a program for providing specific kinds of opportunities for educational experiences for specific groups of pupils or individual pupils.

    a. Staff assignments and activities enhance specialization and capitalize on them.

    b. Pupils at advanced levels of study in an area have opportunities to work with a competent and enthusiastic teacher in that specialty.

    c. Schedules and administrative arrangements enable pupils to work in inter-age groups and cross-grade levels in educational activities.

    d. There are no school "dropouts"—pupils withdraw from the formal, day program when they are deemed ready to engage in other types of career activities.

C. The Instructional Program:

Basic Concept—*A humane secondary school is one that provides a broad and comprehensive curriculum in which ample opportunities exist for the optimum exploration and development at the adolescent level of talents and capabilities of all youth of the community, and one in which teaching and instruction are primarily designed to foster such development.*

1. Such a school offers ample courses at appropriate levels of depth and sophistication to enable each adolescent to develop his talents and potentialities.

a. Offerings are available in each of the fields appropriate for study at the secondary level.

b. Advanced courses are offered in each area of study so that the most talented students in that area are adequately served.

c. A broad variety of programs for specialization are offered so that pupils may elect programs and courses on the basis of post-secondary career plans or of personal significance to them.

d. A variety of class sections as to content, methods of instruction, level of scholarship, and expectations set for pupils are available in required areas of study.

e. Appropriate interdisciplinary and inter-area types of programs are offered, particularly seminar-type discussion groups on significant issues and problems in group and personal living.

f. The staff continuously appraises and evaluates its offerings and the content and instructional methods used, and reconstructs the curriculum to take account of new forces, new knowledge, and new conditions as is deemed desirable.

2. Ample opportunities exist for adolescents individually to study and to engage in other types of learning activities such as research, creation, experimentation, construction, and design.

a. Pupils are eager to explore the unknown, to weigh alternatives, to question, to probe, to test hypotheses and assumptions, to discover, to inquire, to judge, to alter.

b. They may explore in depth their talents and potentialities.

3. Teaching strategies and methods of instruction are appropriately adapted to the level or levels of development of the pupils included in a class or subgroup.

a. All teachers seek to challenge each pupil to work at his optimum level of potentiality at his present stage of development.

b. A variety of instructional methods and learning resources are used in all areas of study.

c. Pupils have opportunities to explore predictable changes in society and the world, to consider their roles in such a world, and to formulate plans for fulfilling such roles.

d. Teacher classroom behavior is characterized by an appropriate degree of openness and indirectness; the total classroom climate of the school is a facilitative one.

4. The program of extra-classroom activities is designed to contribute to the optimum development of pupils.

a. The program is broad and comprehensive so that all pupils have an opportunity to pursue in depth at least one major interest or specialty.

b. Pupils are given maximum opportunity for planning, directing, and carrying out activities.

c. Only activities that have the possibilities of making significant contributions to the realization of aims and objectives of the school are sponsored.

d. Extensive efforts are made to provide a program of activities among which each pupil may find one of great appeal, and then to encourage participation by every pupil.

D. Human Relationships:

Basic Concept—*A humane secondary school is one in which each adolescent in the community served by the school is treated by staff, peers, and citizens alike with dignity and respect as a person. He is entitled, equally with every other adolescent, to the fullest possible opportunity for optimum development of his own particular potentialities and capabilities.*

1. Relationships among teachers and pupils in such a school are mutually respectful, courteous, and consistent with human dignity.

a. A warm, congenial, and humane relationship pervades the entire school community. Its people do "care."

b. The social and educational climate of the school fosters excellence in all aspects of the school's program.

c. Teachers are enthusiastic, dynamic individuals who show by their actions and behavior that they thoroughly enjoy the opportunities to teach and work with adolescents. Each is "himself a person."

d. The pupils exude enthusiasm, spirit, confidence, respect, and high morale.

e. Teachers are supportive, open, and facilitative.

2. Adolescents are not stereotyped or classified for instructional purposes on the basis of race, ethnic origin, income level of family, place or type of residence, or a narrow, inadequate measure of "intelligence."

a. Pupils are grouped for instruction on the basis of the optimum benefit that will accrue to the pupil himself in terms of his total development.

b. Leadership roles or opportunities for developing particular talents are open to all pupils on the basis of criteria germane to the nature of the learning activity itself.

c. No pupil is unable to participate in the total program of the school because of personal lack of money, equipment, or clothing.

3. Teachers and other staff persons seek continuously to get all pupils who can benefit significantly from specific types of educational experiences or programs to participate in appropriate activities of this kind.

4. The guidance, health, and special education services of the school are designed to foster the optimum development of each pupil, and to assist him in his total growth and development.

a. Every effort is made to appraise fully and adequately the talents, capabilities, and potentialities of each pupil and to assist him in participating in the types of opportunities for educational experiences that will contribute significantly to his total development.

b. The self-realization and self-actualization of each pupil are the primary goals of these special services for pupils.

c. The staffs of these service agencies are adequately informed about the nature and character of human growth and development and use this knowledge in their work with pupils.

ASCD Publications

YEARBOOKS

Balance in the Curriculum	Raises questions and issues affecting balance in instruction	$4.00
Evaluation as Feedback and Guide	Advocates replacing grades, marks, tests and credits with a simpler and more basic evaluation which is illustrated	6.50
Fostering Mental Health in Our Schools	Relates mental health to the growth and development of children and youth in school	3.00
Guidance in the Curriculum	Treats that part of guidance which can and should be done by teachers	3.75
Individualizing Instruction	Seeks to identify and enhance human potential	4.00
Leadership for Improving Instruction	Illustrates leadership role of persons responsible for improving instruction	3.75
Learning and Mental Health in the School	Examines school's role in enhancing competence and self-actualization of pupils	5.00
Learning and the Teacher	Analyzes classroom practices, seeking to derive ideas and concepts about learning	3.75
Life Skills in School and Society		5.50
New Insights and the Curriculum	Examines new ideas in seven frontier areas	5.00
Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A New Focus for Education	Applies new psychological insights in education	4.50
Research for Curriculum Improvement	Helps teachers and others carry on successful research in school or classroom	4.00
Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director		4.50
Youth Education: Problems, Perspectives, Promises		5.50

PAMPHLETS

Assessing and Using Curriculum Content	$1.00
Better Than Rating	1.25
Changing Curriculum Content	1.00
Changing Curriculum: Mathematics, The	2.00
Changing Curriculum: Modern Foreign Languages, The	2.00
Changing Curriculum: Science, The	1.50
Children's Social Learning	1.75
Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction	1.00
Criteria for Theories of Instruction	2.00
Curriculum Change: Direction and Process	2.00
Curriculum Decisions ↔ Social Realities	2.75
Curriculum Materials 1968	2.00
Discipline for Today's Children and Youth	1.00
Early Childhood Education Today	2.00
Educating the Children of the Poor	2.00
Elementary School Mathematics: A Guide to Current Research	2.75
Elementary School Science: A Guide to Current Research	2.25
Elementary School We Need, The	1.25
Extending the School Year	1.25
Freeing Capacity To Learn	1.00
Guidelines for Elementary Social Studies	1.50
High School We Need, The	.50
Human Variability and Learning	1.50
Humanities and the Curriculum, The	2.00
Humanizing Education: The Person in the Process	$2.25
Improving Language Arts Instruction Through Research	2.75
Influences in Curriculum Change	2.25
Intellectual Development: Another Look	1.75
Junior High School We Need, The	1.00
Junior High School We Saw, The	1.50
Juvenile Delinquency	1.00
Language and Meaning	2.75
Learning More About Learning	1.00
Linguistics and the Classroom Teacher	2.75
New Curriculum Developments	1.75
New Dimensions in Learning	1.50
New Elementary School, The	2.50
Nurturing Individual Potential	1.50
Personalized Supervision	1.75
Strategy for Curriculum Change	1.25
Supervision in Action	1.25
Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions	2.00
Supervisor: Agent for Change in Teaching, The	3.25
Theories of Instruction	2.00
Toward Professional Maturity	1.50
What Are the Sources of the Curriculum?	1.50
What Does Research Say About Arithmetic?	1.00
Child Growth Chart	.25

Discounts on quantity orders of same title to single address: 2-9 copies, 10%; 10 or more copies, 20%. Orders for $2 or less must be accompanied by remittance. Postage and handling will be charged on all orders not accompanied by payment.

Subscription to EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP—$5.50 a year. ASCD Membership dues: Regular (subscription and yearbook)—$10.00 a year; Comprehensive (includes subscription and yearbook plus other publications issued during period of the membership)—$15.00 a year.

Order from:

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

128/129